The Office of this JOURNAL *and of the* WEEKLY REPORTER, *is now at* 12, *Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.*

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is—Town, 26s., Country 28s.; with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, *52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 4s. 6d.*

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 17, 1871.

OUR READERS will take notice that the Court of Appeal in Chancery will in future take bankruptcy appeals on Thursdays instead of Saturdays.

THE WASHINGTON CONVENTION has undergone a severe criticism in the House of Lords this week, upon Earl Russell's motion. Earl Russell's motion, which was for an address to the Crown against the ratification of the Convention, was a protest against that part of the draft Treaty in which for the purposes of the arbitration a retrospective rule of international law is assumed. As Lord Cairns pointed out, it would be impossible for this country, in honour and honesty, to refuse now to ratify the Convention, negotiated as it has been by Plenipotentiaries armed with powers such as those which were committed to the English members of the Joint High Commission. The motion, however, served to draw on an exhaustive discussion on the Convention as a matter of policy, of international law, and as affecting international relations, as affecting also our national dignity. We should perhaps be travelling out of our province if we entered upon criticism from the first and last of these points of view. We have thought, however, and see no reason to change our opinion, that this country did owe to the belligerents at the time of the American Civil War a duty of using reasonable diligence to prevent our ports from being used by either belligerent as bases from which to launch armed and equipped war vessels at the other, and from this point of view, it is reasonable that the arbitration should proceed on that assumption. But Lord Cairns brings a serious charge against the phraseology of the arbitration clause.* The arbitrators are to assume that a neutral Government is bound—First, to use "due diligence" to prevent the fitting out, &c., within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise against a friendly power. Secondly, not to permit or suffer either belligerent to use her ports, &c., as a base of naval operations, &c. Thirdly, to use due diligence within her own ports, &c., to prevent violation of the foregoing. Lord Cairns says the Convention ought to have added some test of what is due diligence, and seems to think that in the absence of any kind of definition it will not be open to Great Britain to argue, before the arbitrators, that she did all that her own municipal law would allow her to do, though that law forbad her to act on mere presumptions in the absence of evidence. But it seems to us that due diligence and reasonable diligence must mean the same thing, and that the words "reasonable ground to suppose" also answer this objection in the negative. Another objection to this clause was that the words "due diligence" are omitted in the second of the rules above cited. We certainly do not see why they should have been so omitted, unless upon the supposition that "permit or suffer" means "permit or suffer by failure of due diligence;" moreover both the first and second rules appear to be governed by the third.

Sir Roundell Palmer elicited from the Government, in the Lower House, that it is admitted and acknowledged as between the Government of the United States and our own, that the second rule is not to be taken as comprehending the export of contraband of war in ordinary course of commerce. This indeed must in common sense and justice have been clear, but the assurance removes a doubt which appears to have been raised in the minds of some.

* The text is quoted, *ante* p. 581.

WHEN LORD HATHERLEY'S Appellate Jurisdiction Bills of last year were before the Legislature, we offered in these columns our own suggestions as to the best method of securing fitting courts, capable of deciding with adequate promptitude the increasing multitude of colonial appeals. At the present moment we desire merely to notice the magnitude of the evil which is demanding redress. Lord Westbury, on Monday, attacked the Government for allowing this important subject to remain unprovided for until the arrears of Judicial Committee appeals had reached the enormous amount of 400 and upwards. Lord Westbury's language is not a whit too strong. It is simply a scandalous thing that the inhabitants of Canada or Australia, who are as much a part of the nation as if they dwelt in Devonshire or Cumberland, should be driven, through the neglect of the home Government to provide an efficient appellate tribunal, to consider whether they cannot dispose of their appellate business better for themselves.

MR. JUSTICE WILLES, sitting at chambers, has strongly expressed his disinclination to undertake the necessary investigations in order to determine whether a judgment debtor should be committed to prison under section 5 of the Debtors Act, 1869. Indeed, it would appear as if he had almost gone so far as to refuse to enter upon such enquiries.

Nothing, no doubt, can be much more inconvenient than for a judge to have to conduct such examinations at chambers. It takes up an immense time, and is extremely annoying to those whose cases are delayed thereby. And as far as the parties are concerned, the inquiry is necessarily somewhat unsatisfactory. But the power of imprisonment can only be exercised "when it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the person making default either has, or has had since the date of the order or judgment the means to pay the sum, in respect of which he has made default, and has refused or neglected, or refuses or neglects to pay the same. A judge can only be satisfied of these things by evidence; and therefore, as long as the Act is in force, we fear that the judges will have to hear evidence in support of applications for committal.

SEVERAL NEWSPAPERS have been during the last few days indulging in some choice vituperation against the judge of the Lambeth County Court for having committed a debtor to prison for forty days for non-payment of a debt of a few shillings, the costs being represented as considerably more than the debt. The case is put forward as one of an oppressive landlord using the machinery of the county court for the purpose of punishing an innocent man, and the judge lending his authority to the rich man to enable him to gratify his vindictiveness against a tenant who was too poor to raise a few shillings. The improbabilities of the case thus stated seemed so great, that we have caused inquiries to be made into the exact facts, and we find that they are as follows:—The case was that of *House* v. *Pike*, heard in the Lambeth Court on the 22nd of December, 1869. The parties are in the same position in life, earning, as labourers, from £1 to £1 4s. per week. The plaintiff had let a room to the defendant, and the action was brought for 12s. 3d. rent in arrear when the defendant gave up possession. The defendant

appeared and pleaded that he had received notice to quit, and he was not liable for rent after that notice, although he occupied more than a fortnight afterwards. The judge told him that was all nonsense, he must pay rent for the whole of the time, and then, after inquiring about his means to pay, made an order for payment at 4s. per month. The defendant declared that he only owed six or seven shillings, and would pay no more. In March, June, and July in the following year, judgment summonses were issued, none of which the plaintiff was able to serve, and the plaintiff had to lose the costs in each case. Ultimately, in April this year, a judgment summons was served, and came on for hearing on March 8, when the defendant not appearing the plaintiff's wife gave evidence as to defendant's means of payment. The judge said it was quite clear he could have paid the sum of 15s. 3d., the original debt and costs, in a period of nearly a year and a half. It was a case of mere obstinacy, apparently because the defendant was not allowed to be judge in his own case, and he should mark his sense of the defendant's conduct by committing him for forty days. Probably most readers will think that considerable ingenuity was required to make out of these facts a case of "landlord's oppression" and "county court tyranny."

IT MAY NOW BE TAKEN as decided, by the decisions of the Court of Queen's Bench in *Clarke* v. *Stanford*, and of the Common Pleas in *Allen* v. *Tunbridge* (reported in this week's number of the *Weekly Reporter*), that carriages standing for hire at railway stations are hackney carriages within the meaning of the last Metropolitan Public Carriage Act. This decision may perhaps benefit the ordinary cab drivers by doing away with a small amount of not very formidable opposition, but it can do little good to the public. It is, we think, sufficiently shown that the judges in the Common Pleas did not quite agree with the Queen's Bench, but thought it desirable to follow the former decision. In fact, however, by so doing they were really deciding between the Courts of Exchequer and Queen's Bench; for *Case* v. *Story*, in the Exchequer, was certainly more in point than was supposed. The words in one statute are, "in any public street or road, at any place within a certain distance of," etc. In the other they are, "in any public street, road, or place within the limits of," etc. It is difficult to see why a railway station should be included within the latter expression and not within the former.

THE IRISH LAND ACT AND THE ULSTER CUSTOM.

While the Irish Land Act was still before Parliament we ventured to point out that its first and second clauses must inevitably give rise to extreme difficulties, difficulties, not only of detail, but affecting the very essence and first principles of the enactments in question; and, after the Act had become law, we further explained the reasons for which we thought the effect of these sections matter of grave doubt. Our anticipations have been very quickly fulfilled. In a late case, which has excited much attention, relating to certain estates of the Marquis of Waterford, the construction of the first section of the Act had to be considered first in the Irish Landed Estates Court, and secondly, in the Court of Appeal in Chancery.

The form in which the question arose in that case was this:—The estates were about to be sold in the Landed Estates Court. There were a number of tenants from year to year upon the estates, who claimed to be entitled to the benefit of the tenant right custom. These tenants demanded that the Landed Estates Court's conveyance should not only shew them to be tenants from year to year, but should further show that they held under the custom, contending that this was necessary in order to secure to them the benefit for the custom of the future.

Section 61 of the Landed Estates Court Act enacts, that a conveyance under the Court shall pass the property. "Subject to such charges, tenancies, rights of common or other easements, leases and underleases, as may be expressed or referred to therein; but save as aforesaid. . . . discharged from all former and other estates, rights, titles, charges, and incumbrances whatsoever. . . ." Section 1 of the Irish Land Act enacts that "the usages prevalent in the province of Ulster, which are known as . . . . the Ulster Tenant Right Custom, are hereby declared to be legal, and shall in the case of any holding in the province of Ulster, proved to be subject thereto, be enforced in manner provided by this Act." Section 16 of the same Act says that "every tenant entitled under the Act to make any claim in respect of any right, or for payment of any sums due to him by way of compensation, and about to quit his holding," may make a claim in a certain form; and the following sections provide for the decision of such claims. Now, what is Ulster Tenant Right? Much as it varies from place to place, it always is, or was, a custom according to which the landlord was bound to hold his hand, and allow the tenant, as long as he paid his rent and otherwise did his duty as tenant, to hold the land himself or sell it to another. It turned a tenancy for years into a sort of customary perpetuity. It created, as was said by an eminent writer many years ago, an embryo copyhold tenure, a copyhold tenure not recognised as such by law.

Such being the facts and the sections of the Acts necessary to be considered, it was argued in the case to which we refer, on the part of the tenants, that their interest in the land under the custom was an "estate" or "right" quite apart from their tenancy from year to year, and would therefore be barred by the Landed Estates Court conveyance, unless expressly mentioned. It was argued on the other side that the Tenant Right was a mere incident of the tenancy from year to year like a right to emblements or any right of the same kind so often annexed to a tenancy by custom. Lynch, J., in the Landed Estates Court, and Lord O'Hagan in the Court of Appeal, adopted this latter view, and accordingly rejected the application of the tenants to have their rights under the custom set out in the conveyance, on the ground that such a course was wholly unnecessary. Christian, L.J., agreed in refusing the application of the tenants, but upon very different grounds. So far from thinking that the Tenant Right of the tenants would survive the conveyance, whether mentioned therein or not, his view (so far as we can gather from the newspaper reports) seems to be that the sections relating to Ulster Tenant Right are sheer nonsense, and therefore wholly inoperative.

If a strictly literal contruction be placed upon section 1 and upon section 16 and those that follow it, we are inclined to think that the Lord Justice is right, for those sections legalise Tenant Right, and then provide for its enforcement in a manner quite inconsistent with its existence. But Acts of Parliament are never construed in such a spirit now-a-days; nor can they be, for not one section in five, if construed with the same strictness which men apply to other documents, would bear any meaning whatever. We think it probable that the meaning which Lynch, J., and Lord O'Hagan, put upon the Act will ultimately prevail. They seem to say that the right acquired by an Ulster tenant under the Act is a right to be compensated if evicted in a manner inconsistent with the custom. And they, not unreasonably, hold this right to be a mere incident of the tenancy, not an estate or right superadded to it.

This interpretation of the Act, we say, will probably prevail. At any rate, by the bill which Lord Cairns has just brought in, the inference drawn from it with respect to the effect of a Landed Estates Court conveyance seems about to receive legislative sanction. But it is plain that, so interpreted, the Act is an Act for the abolition of the Ulster Tenant Right custom. The custom said—the landlord shall not evict. The Act says—he may if he pleases, provided he make compensation.

The Lord Justice has disavowed the newspaper reports of his judgment, and therefore we cannot be sure that

we have correctly conveyed the grounds of his judgment. For the same reason we feel bound to abstain from any comment upon the language in which his views were conveyed, or the observations which he is reported to have made upon many topics not necessary to the decision of the point before him. We sincerely hope that when we have an opportunity of reading a full report of his judgment, the very painful impression which the newspaper reports of it have produced may be removed.

EFFECT OF WINDING UP ON LANDLORD'S RIGHT TO DISTRAIN.

The two sections of the Companies Act, 1862, governing this question are ss. 87 & 163. By s. 87, when an order has been made for winding up a company no action, suit, or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company, except with the leave of the Court, and subject to such terms as the Court may impose. By s. 163, where a company is being wound up by the Court, or subject to the supervision of the Court, any attachment, sequestration, distress, or execution put in force against the estate or effects of the company, after the commencement of the winding up, shall be void to all intents.

According to Lord Hatherley in *Re London Cotton Company* (14 W. R. 573, L. R. 2 Eq. 53) the two sections are perfectly consistent, and may be read together. The 163rd section is controlled by the 87th section, and the conjoint operation of the two sections, where a distress or execution was issued against the effects of a company, either before a petition for winding up, or between a petition and the winding-up order, is to put the creditor to the necessity of coming to the Court for leave to proceed.

In the case of the *Exhall Coal Mining Company* (12 W. R. 727, on appeal, 4 N. R. 127), leave was given to the landlord to proceed to realise a distress put in after the presentation of the winding up petition, yet before the making of the winding up order, notwithstanding section 163, and there are several cases which arose on execution, but are, of course, equally applicable to distress. In *Re London Cotton Company* (*sup.*) leave was given to a creditor to proceed with an execution, though the winding-up order had been made: but then the writ was in the hands of the sheriff, who would have been in possession at the date of the winding up order, but for the door having been shut in the face of his officer, so that the decision proceeds upon the same ground as if the officer had been actually in possession at the date of the winding up order. In *Re Great Ship Company* (12 W. R. 189) the sheriff's officer was actually in possession at the date of the winding up order, and the Lords Justices considered that the creditor was entitled to realise the fruits of his execution by a sale of the goods, notwithstanding the winding up had commenced before the sale could be had, and refused to stay the sale. And in *Re Baston & Company* (14 W. R. 1033, L. R. 4 Eq. 681), where execution issued after the presentation of the petition, but before the order was made, Vice-Chancellor Malins refused to stay proceedings under the execution, it being a case in which the discretion of the Court might properly be exercised by giving leave to proceed.

The object of the 163rd section, as we collect from the observations of the Vice-Chancellor in *Re London Cotton Company*, was to protect the general body of creditors against acts of fraudulent preference, not to deprive a *bonâ fide* judgment creditor of the fruits of his diligence, if he has succeeded in issuing execution before the making of the order for winding up, but owing to circumstances over which he has no control has not sold the property taken in execution. From the moment when the order is made he cannot proceed without leave, and it is a matter for the discretion of the Court whether or not leave will be given. If leave be given the Court may, as in *Re Baston & Co.* (*sup.*), put him on terms with respect to the particular description of property to be taken in execution; or the Court may direct the sheriff to deliver the goods seized to the liquidator, to be sold in the winding up, reserving to the execution creditors the same priority against the proceeds of sale as if the sale had been made by the sheriff under the distress in the usual way (*Re Plas yn Mhowys Mining Company*, L. R. 4 Eq. 659).

We have seen under what circumstances the Court will allow a distress or an execution taken or issued before the date of the winding-up order to be proceeded with after the date of the order. A distress taken *after* the date of the winding up order will only be allowed, where the Company have retained, not merely formal, but actual possession of the property for carrying on the business of the liquidation (per Lord Romilly M. R. in *Re Progress Assurance Company*), (18 W. R. Ch. dig. 57, L. R. 9 eq. 370). This is a point which was a good deal elucidated the other day in *Re Lundy Granite Company* (19 W. R. 609). As a creditor for rent due at the date of the winding up the landlord is in exactly the same position as any other unsecured creditor, and can only prove in the winding up for the amount due, unless he has levied before the making of the order, in which case, as we have already seen, he may obtain leave to proceed to a sale. But if after the commencement of the winding up, the liquidator continue in possession for his own purposes, he is liable to pay for occupation, and to be distrained on for rent accrued due subsequently to the winding up, exactly like any other tenant. As Lord Justice Mellish explained in *Re Lundy Granite Company* (*sup.*), if the liquidator for convenience chooses not to surrender the lease, but to continue in possession, the landlord ought to be paid his full rent from the commencement of the winding up. If so, then the landlord has his ordinary common law right, without the leave of the Court first obtained, to distrain for rent accrued due after the commencement of the winding up. On the other hand, where the premises have been retained, not for the purposes of the liquidator, but for benefit of all parties, the distress will be a void proceeding under s. 163, and the landlord will be put to his proof as an ordinary creditor (*Re Progress Assurance Company*, *sup.*).

We have seen what are the rights of a landlord with regard to distress, where a company are his tenants, both before and after the winding up. In *Re Lundy Granite Company*, (*sup.*) the company were not the tenants of the landlord, but their goods happened to be on the demised premises at the time when the landlord distrained for rent: and the question was—the winding up order having been made—whether the leave of the Court was required under section 87, as a condition precedent to the exercise of his legal right to distrain and sell their goods. In other words, does the section 163 apply where the distress is not a proceeding against the company, but a proceeding against a third person, in the course of which the goods of the company, which happen to be lying on the property demised to that person, come to be seized? The Master of the Rolls, whose judgment will be found *in extenso* in a note to the report of *Re Lundy Granite Company* (*ubi sup.*), held that the distress was in substance "a proceeding against the estate or effects" of the company within the 163rd. section, and, therefore, that it could not issue or be put in force without the leave of the Court. His Lordship accordingly decided that the distress ought not to issue, but gave leave to the landlord to prove for the amount due to him, not as a creditor of the company, which he was not, but as a person who, by reason of the rights against the company's property, which the law of distress gives him ought to be placed in the same situation as if he were a creditor of the company.

The fallacy of this reasoning becomes apparent, if we consider that the winding up sections of the Companies Act 1862 relate only to creditors and contributories of companies. Third parties, such as

the landlord in this instance, are not within their scope. The operation of the 163rd section of the Act is confined, according to Lord Justice James (19 W. R. 611) to proceedings taken by a creditor of the company against property of the company. Nor was it, according to Lord Justice Mellish, the intention of the Legislature to deal in any way with the rights of a landlord who is a total stranger to the company. The landlord distrains for rent due upon property found on the demised premises, and happening to belong to a third party, with whom he has no privity whatever. That third party proves to be a company which is being wound up; but that circumstance does not affect the right of the landlord to seize it under the distress. The 163rd section, then, is confined to the case of a distress levied against the company as debtor, and does not extend to every distress under which property of the company may be taken by the common law of England. This is a conclusion which should be noted.

The sole object of the Act, in the language of Lord Justice James, was to make a kind of equitable bankruptcy for the benefit of the creditors or contributories. If the liquidator leaves goods of the company in the order and disposition of a trader who becomes bankrupt, there is nothing in the Companies Act to protect the goods, and so, by a parity of reasoning, if he leaves goods in a place where they are liable to be distrained on by the landlord. In *Re Lundy Granite Company* (*sup.*) the liquidator's counsel offered to allow the landlord to prove in the winding up for the value of the goods seized, and the Master of the Rolls made his order on that footing. But in what character was the landlord to prove? Not as a creditor of the company, for he was not one, as the Master of the Rolls acknowledged; yet his Lordship appears to have regarded him as a person, who by virtue of his right to distrain, had a sort of claim upon the property of the company without being a creditor of that company—an anomalous position enough. It is not easy, indeed, to see how his Lordship could have felt himself at liberty to allow the claim, unless with the consent of the liquidator, to whom, of course, the admittance of the proof would have been a preferable alternative to the goods themselves being taken.

The short effect of the 163rd section, as qualified by the decision in *Re Lundy Granite Company*, is as follows:—"Where a company is being wound up by the Court, or subject to the supervision of the Court, any attachment, sequestration, distress, or execution, put in force *by a creditor of the company* against the estate or effects of the company, after the commencement of the winding up shall be void to all intent, *unless put in force with the leave of the Court, and subject to such terms as the Court may impose.*" Both the leave and the terms are matters for the discretion of the Court, but the reader will be able to form from the cases referred to, a good general idea as to the class of cases in which leave will be given. Perhaps the most noteworthy point in *Re Lundy Granite Company* is the decision that, where a company by their liquidator continue after the winding up to occupy land of which they are the tenants, the landlord is entitled to receive the full rent accruing due from the commencement of the winding up, and presumably to distrain for such rent, if need be. For it must be inferred from the observations of the Lords Justices in *Re Lundy Granite Company*, that if a landlord come to the Court for leave to distrain on the property of a company in liquidation, for rent accrued due since the commencement of the winding up, the Court will give him leave to distrain, unless, as in *Re Progress Insurance Company* (*sup.*) the liquidators were retaining possession for the benefit of all parties, and not for the benefit of the company's estate.

Lieutenant Kenneth M. E. Kerr, of the 96th Regiment, eldest son of Robert Malcolm Kerr, Esq., Judge of the City of London Court, died at Meerut, in India, on the 15th of May

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

PUBLIC BODY—EXCESS OF STATUTORY AUTHORITY—INJUNCTION.

Grand Junction Canal Company v. *Shugar*, L.C., 19 W. R. 569.

This decision involves a principle which we have to keep in sight whenever we consider a case of interference by a public body with private rights. In the construction of their works, Local Boards of Health, like railway companies, canal companies, and other bodies incorporated by Acts of Parliament, are bound to keep within the powers conferred on them by the Legislature. When damage results from the act of such a body, the question is, whether such act was authorised or not. If it was, the sanction of the Legislature takes away the unlawful character of the act, and consequently, no action or suit will lie (*R.* v. *Pease*, 4 B. & A. 30), but the only remedy is under the compensation clauses which are inserted in order to protect private rights; so that, if there be no proviso for compensation applicable to the particular case, the injured person is altogether remediless (*R.* v. *Pease*, *sup.*), that is to say, in a case where the injury might have been contemplated by the Legislature; for, where new and unforeseen circumstances arise, under which the power which could originally be exercised without causing any injury, can no longer be so exercised, an action will lie (*Reg.* v. *Bradford Navigation Co.*, 13 W. R. 892, 6 B. & S. 631).

When these public bodies go beyond the limits of their authority, and infringe or violate the rights of others, they become, like individuals, amenable to the jurisdiction of the Court by injunction. (*Frewin* v. *Lewis*, 4 My. & Cr. 249). This may be, either by the doing of unauthorised acts, or by the doing of authorised acts in an unauthorised manner; for, although the particular public body is in general the proper judge of the mode of executing its own works (*London and Birmingham Railway Company* v. *Grand Junction Canal Company*, 1 Ry. Cas. 225), and the provision in section 16 of the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, that the company shall do as little damage as may be in the execution of their works, relates to the mode of doing works authorised to be done, but does not regulate what those are to be (*Reg.* v. *East and West India Docks Railway Company*, 2 El. & B. 466, 1 W. R. 409), yet the Court will interfere, if there is reason to consider the conduct of the public body inconsistent with good faith (*Coats* v. *Clarence Railway Company*, 1 R. & M. 181.)

In *Grand Junction Canal Company* v. *Shugar*, the Lord Chancellor drew the distinction between prohibition and compensation, to which we have adverted. The defendants, the Watford Local Board of Health, were expressly forbidden, under the Local Government Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 98), s. 73, to do any act which should interfere with the flow of water, to which the plaintiffs were entitled as supplying their canal. By a sewer, constructed in pursuance of their Parliamentary powers, the Local Board did interfere with the defendants' water, and the Lord Chancellor held it a case for restraint and not for compensation, on the ground that the defendants, had deliberately over stepped the limits of their authority. The case is not unlike *Reg.* v. *Darlington Board of Health* (13 W. R. 789, 6 B. & S. 562), where a Local Board, in execution of their powers, made a sewer which injuriously affected the flow of water to the plaintiff's mill, without the consent of the plaintiff first obtained, and it was held that, in consequence of the express provision in the Local Government Act that nothing in the Act should authorise the Local Board to injuriously affect the stream, the plaintiff's claim was the ground of an action, and not the subject of compensation.

In the case of a public body, as in the case of an individual offender, the plaintiff, must generally speak-

ing, satisfy the Court that he has sustained material damage by the violation of a legal right, in order to entitle himself to an injunction (*Holyoake* v. *Shrewsbury & Birmingham Railway Company*, 5 Ry. Cas. 421) according to the law laid down in *Spottiswoode* v. *Clarke* (2 Ph. 156). Where, however, the act prohibited is obviously prohibited for the protection of a particular person or body, it is not necessary to allege special damage (*Chamberlaine* v. *Chester* and *Birkenhead Railway Company* 1 Ex. 877) or as the Lord Chancellor said in *Grand Junction Canal Company* v. *Shugar*, when the Legislature has expressly said that the public body shall not overstep their power in a particular direction, the amount of damage, unless it be so trivial as to show that the suit is purely of a vexatious character, will not be taken into consideration at all, but an injunction will be granted.

PRIORITY—CONTEMPORANEOUS NOTICE.

Re Metropolitan Railway Company, Tower Hill Extension Act, and *Re Rawlins' Estate, Ex parte Kent*, M. R., 19 W. R. 596.

This decision may usefully be noted, that the priority of incumbrancers upon a fund in Court is regulated by the dates of their stop orders; though the aim of the Court seems to have been rather to do substantial justice in a very close run case, than to establish a general principle. It so happened that both orders were obtained on the same day, one later than the other; and the Master of the Rolls accordingly allowed both incumbrancers to rank *pari passu* with each other and divide the fund rateably, being of opinion that he could not judicially regard divisions of time less than a day in such a case (see *Sanger* v. *Sanger*, 19 W. R. 792, L. R. 11 Eq. 470).

The following are the general rules with regard to notice. No notice is available until the fund has come into the hands of the person to whom the notice is given in trust for the owner (*Yates* v. *Cox*, 17 W. R. 20). Subject to this universal rule the priority of incumbrancers is regulated, in the first instance, by the order in which they give notice to the holder of the fund. Where two or more incumbrancers give notice simultaneously, their priorities, *inter se*, are regulated by the order of date of their respective securities. And in such a case it may be taken for granted that the Court will regard as simultaneous all notices given on the same day at whatever hours on that day they may have been given. In an unreported case of *Cox* v. *Cumberland*, last term, in which the question was as to the priority of a swarm of incumbrancers upon the proceeds of sale of an officer's commission, the Master of the Rolls treated as simultaneous notices served on the army agent at ten o'clock in the morning and half-past one o'clock in the afternoon of the day, upon which the proceeds of sale of the commission were carried to the officer's separate account in the army agent's books. The reader who is curious in these matters may refer to *Yates* v. *Cox* (*ubi sup.*), and to *Boss* v. *Hopkinson*, (18 W. R. 725), and to our remarks on these cases (13 S. J. 165, and 14 S. J. 730). Then when two or more incumbrancers are simultaneous in point of date, as well as of notice, as in the case we are now commenting upon, there is nothing for it but to let them take rateably *inter se*.

COMMON LAW.

LOCAL BOARD.—LIABILITY FOR NEGLIGENCE.

Foreman and Wife v. *Mayor of Canterbury*, Q.B., 19 W. R. 719.

The plaintiffs sued the defendants in respect of injuries sustained by them through the overturning of their cart by a heap of stones, left at night on the road, unguarded and unlighted, by men employed by the defendants (acting as a Local Board of Health) to repair the road. Since the decision in the *Mersey Docks* v. *Gibbs*, (14 W. R. 872, L. R. 1 H. L. 93), it would seem that the liability of the defendants was clear; and in fact the only point raised was, that the defendants must be taken to have acted not as a Local Board, but as surveyors under s. 117 of the Public Health Act, 1848, and that as such they were not liable. This was a transparent absurdity; and the case of *Young* v. *Davies*, (10 W. R. 524, which was cited in support of it, was wholly inapplicable, for it decided nothing but that a surveyor was not liable to an action for damage caused by non-repair. No one ever suggested, and certainly no case has decided, that if a surveyor himself employed servants to do work, whether on a public road or elsewhere, he could not be liable for their negligent acts. The utility of the present case is perhaps confined to the express discrediting of the decision in *Holliday* v. *St. Leonard's, Shoreditch* (9 W. R. 694); there could be no doubt that that case was in effect overturned by *Mersey Docks* v. *Gibbs*, but so apt are lawyers to cite cases already dead and twice killed, that it is useful to have the distinct declaration of an authoritative tribunal upon any such case, that it is dead indeed.

NEGLIGENCE—TRESPASS—LANDLORD—TENANTS.

Carstairs v. *Taylor*, Ex., 19 W. R. 723.

In this case the attempt was made to push the rule laid down in *Rylands* v. *Fletcher* (14 W. R. 799, L. R. 3 H. L. 330), to an unwarrantable length. The plaintiff had hired of the defendant the ground-floor of a warehouse; the defendant himself occupying the upper part of the premises. A rat gnawed a hole in a box into which the gutters of the roof collected the rainwater, and from which it was discharged into the drains; and through this hole the rainwater entered the warehouse, and penetrated to and damaged the plaintiff's goods. The contention that there was any obligation on the defendant, as landlord, to keep the premises water-tight in all events, was not very strenuously urged, and there was no ground to impute negligence; but the principal argument used for the plaintiff was that the defendant had collected the water in an artificial mode, and that it was by reason of his so collecting it that the mischief had happened. It was in this way that the plaintiff sought to take advantage of *Rylands* v. *Fletcher*; but an obvious distinction was pointed out by Bramwell, B., namely, that in that case the defendants had done what they did for their own purposes entirely, whereas, here, the collection of the rainwater by the customary apparatus was for the benefit of the plaintiff as much as of the defendant. Much reliance was placed on *Bell* v. *Twentyman* (1 Q. B. 766), and particularly on some expressions used by the Court in delivering judgment. But it seems not to have been noticed that in that case the declaration averred, and the plea did not deny, the existence of a duty on the defendant to cleanse the watercourse the obstruction of which was complained of, and this was the basis of the whole of the plaintiff's argument. The only point for the decision of the Court (besides one which does not concern us) was, whether the allegation in the plea that defendant cleansed within a reasonable time after notice was an answer. The Court would have been going very much out of their way if they had considered and decided the question of whether the alleged duty did or did not exist; indeed there were no materials before them for doing so. Yet this is what they are supposed to have done at p. 774. If, however, the passage about the middle of that page is examined, it will, we think, be evident that the whole difficulty arises from an error of punctuation. The Court having disposed of an argument by which the defendant attempted to throw the burden of the obstruction upon the plaintiff, and so escape from the liability which the admitted duty would have cast upon him, said, "If the defendant was liable, on general principles he was bound to cleanse and keep open the watercourse at all events." By the omission of the comma after "liable" and its insertion

after "principles," the Court is made by the report to intimate an opinion that the owner of a watercourse is at common law bound to keep it clear at all events; a proposition clearly untrue, and so startling that it ought at once to excite suspicion.

LARCENY—ANIMALS FERÆ NATURÆ.

The Queen v. *Townley*, C.C.R., 19 W. R. 725.

This case is of some value as illustrating the distinction between what will be regarded as one continuous act, and what as two distinct acts. The prisoner was indicted for a larceny of rabbits. He came in a cab and removed rabbits which had been hidden under a hedge, and it was found by the jury that they had been placed there by poachers, who had killed them on land in the same occupation as the place where they were found; it was also to be taken as a fact that the poachers had not intended to abandon possession of them. It was not found by the jury, or stated in the case as assumed, *but it was assumed by the Court* that the prisoner was himself one of the poachers. The Court held that the whole was one continuous act, and that, therefore, although the rabbits did according to *Blades* v. *Higgs* (13 W. R. 727), become the property of the landowner on whose land they were killed, the prisoner was not guilty of larceny. This seems more in accordance with common sense, than the refinement as to an act "not continuated but interpolated," which seems sanctioned by the passage in 1 Hale P. C. 510, commented on by the Court, and explained away in a manner which Lord Hale would probably not have approved. The lapse of time between one particular act and another, or even the temporary absence of the perpetrator from the spot where the goods lie, may be *evidence* of whether the whole is one thing, or whether the acts are to be taken as distinct; but it can be no more. The continued *intent* seems to be the distinguishing test. If, to use the illustration of orchard robbery quoted by Blackburn, J., from Lord Cranworth's judgment in *Blades* v. *Higgs*, the thief after picking the apples found them more than he could carry, and went home for a truck, would the continuity of the act have been broken? It would seem not. But if from the lapse of time or from other circumstances it could be inferred that the thief had given up his intention to remove the goods, but afterwards resumed it and removed them, it could no longer be said that the act was a continuous one.

The case might be noted by game law reformers as illustrative of the anomalies resulting from the present state of the law.

COURTS.

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

(In Banco, before the LORD CHIEF BARON, and MARTIN, BRAMWELL, and CLEASBY, BB.)

June 9.—*Johnson* v. *Emerson and Sparrow.*

It will be remembered that this was an action against a firm of Norwich attorneys for maliciously obtaining an adjudication in bankruptcy against the plaintiff. The action was tried in December last, and the jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff for £1,560. (The facts are stated in our report of the case, *ante* p. 150.)

A rule *nisi* for a new trial was afterwards moved for and obtained, on the grounds—first, that there was reasonable and probable cause for the proceedings in bankruptcy; secondly, that the verdict was against the evidence upon the facts having reference to the presence or absence of reasonable and probable cause, and also on the question of malice. It was urged that there was no evidence of malice.

Parry, Serjt., Henry James, Q.C., and *Topping*, showed cause against the rule.

Huddleston, Q.C., Field, Q.C., and *Merewether*, supported it.

After two days argument their Lordships reserved judgment, and now proceeded to deliver their judgments *seriatim*.

MARTIN and BRAMWELL, BB., were of opinion that the rule ought to be made absolute to enter the verdict for the defendant.

KELLY, C.B., and CLEASBY, B., thought that the verdict ought not to be disturbed and the rule discharged.

June 10.—(In Banco, before the LORD CHIEF BARON, and MARTIN and CLEASBY, BB.)

Field, Q.C., now applied that the junior judge, in accordance with the custom in similar cases, should withdraw his judgment, so that the defendant might appeal in error.

KELLY, C.B., said neither he nor his learned brother Cleasby was at present disposed to withdraw his judgment, but the application might be renewed on Monday.

June 12.—*Huddleston, Q.C.*, now renewed the application, and Bramwell, B., having withdrawn his judgment, the application was granted.

COUNTY COURTS.

LAMBETH.

(Before J. PITT TAYLOR, Esq., Judge.)

June 14.—*Strutton* v. *Johnson.*

The meaning of "forthwith" in an order for payment.

Execution cannot issue on an order of the Court until the record is complete—i.e., *signed by the registrar.*

Mr. Fullager, for the plaintiff, after proving his case, one of no interest except for what followed, asked for and obtained an order for payment forthwith, and shortly afterwards returned into court to make an application. He said, acting on his Honour's order he had applied in the issuing department for an execution against the goods of the defendant, but the registrar's clerk had refused to grant it, on the ground that "forthwith" did not mean the same day, and the execution could not issue until the next morning. Believing the clerk to be wrong he begged to ask his Honour to allow the process to issue immediately. There was a case in point heard before the Exchequer Chamber on appeal, *Ely* v. *Moule and Tombs*, 20 L. J. Ex. 29. The case arose out of an action in the Droitwich County Court, where a forthwith order had been made and an execution levied on the goods of the defendant the same day. The defendant (Ely) then brought an action against the plaintiff and the registrar (Moule and Tombs) for trespass, when the Court found that the proceedings in the county court were regular, and therefore no trespass had been committed. The Exchequer Chamber affirmed this decision, and he (Mr. Fullager) now asked his Honour to act upon that precedent, and allow the execution to issue.

Mr. PITT TAYLOR said in the case quoted the Court was not asked to decide the point now raised. The plaintiff in that case contended that he ought to have been served with an order before his goods were seized, and the Court decided that was not necessary according to the Acts and Rules regulating county courts, and the proceedings were therefore regular. The point now raised was a very different one. The record of the court was not complete until signed by the registrar, and proceedings could not be taken until such completion. That officer did not sign each judgment, but, as provided by the Act, only every page, and it was necessary he should have time to make his record complete before allowing process to issue. The application would therefore be refused.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. ALEXANDER GRADWELL BAGOTT PEARSON, solicitor, of Kirkby Lonsdale, Westmoreland (firm, Pearson & Pearson), has been appointed Registrar of the Kirkby Lonsdale County Court, in succession to Mr. Richard Roper, deceased. Mr. Gradwell Pearson was admitted in 1864.

Mr. DAVID PUGH, solicitor, of Dolgelly, Merionethshire, has been appointed Registrar of the Newtown County Court (Circuit No. 28), in succession to the late Mr. George Woosnam. Mr. Pugh was certificated in 1843, and holds the offices of Deputy Clerk of the Peace for the county, and Clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for the Dolgelly district.

Sir John William Kaye, of the Indian Office, who was recently created a Knight of the order of the Star of India, is a son of the late Charles Kaye, Esq., solicitor to the Bank of England.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

June 9.—The *Ecclesiastical Courts Bill.*—The Earl of Shaftesbury moved the second reading. The bill, with very few exceptions indeed, was almost the identical bill that came down from the select committee. The opposition encountered from the bishops placed him in a great difficulty, and he would, therefore, surrender one part of the measure for the present, with the view of securing the remainder. He had at all times been far more anxious to secure due reforms of the Ecclesiastical Courts in their construction and conduct than to carry any of those clauses relating in some measure to doctrine or discipline. He had been more anxious to secure cheaper and more expeditious tribunals than to carry any of those proposals which raise so much opposition. He would, therefore, withdraw the famous 33rd clause, which gave power to the laity to promote the office of the judge and to constitute suits without the concurrence or approbation of the bishop, with all the clauses connected with it. It was to that that the greatest opposition had apparently been directed, and he proposed to bring it forward as a separate bill next year. He did not attach any great value to it, for were it carried it would very seldom be brought into operation, and he believed, moreover, that the laity have never lost the power which they formerly possessed of promoting the office of the judge. It was not taken from them by the Discipline Act of 1840, and an opportunity would no doubt arise of testing that in the Superior Courts, and of coming to a conclusion upon it without the necessity of enacting it anew. He must remind their Lordships of the judgment pronounced on the Ecclesiastical Courts by high authorities who had maintained the absolute necessity of a thorough reform in them. His Lordship then cited the report of a committee of the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury in 1853, the argument of Lord Cranworth in 1856, in introducing his Bill on the subject, and the opinions of the Bishop of Killaloe and the Archbishop of York in 1865. The latter authority concluded "One necessary provision would be, in any alteration of the Ecclesiastical Courts, that the rules and course of procedure should be assimilated to the Common Law Courts, which worked so well." Now, that was precisely the object of the bill—to assimilate these Courts to the Common Law Courts, to make the process cheaper and more expeditious, and thus to make them accessible to the community at large. There had been numerous instances of the heavy costs involved in some of the suits. The Purchas case took nearly three years, and cost almost £8,000 to one side. This state of things demanded some remedy, and when he showed the means of providing for it, and the large resources at command, they would see that it was still more necessary that no time should be lost. In 1869, when he first brought the question forward, he was told that his financial scheme rested on an insecure basis, and that the funds were not so great as he described them. He afterwards, however, moved for returns from the various dioceses of all the fees, expenditure, and resources, by which the whole of this system might be maintained. He had put the receipts at about £50,000 per annum, but the returns, though not complete, showed that they amounted to £71,794. The Registrar-General informed him that the average of the marriage licence fees for the last 11 years gave 19,620 marriages by licence annually, and 18 by special licence. The fees derived from those licenses amounted to £39,639; from institutions, ordinations, &c., to £13,773; from visitations, procurations, &c., to £13,105; from consecrations and faculties to £3,317, from miscellaneous diocesan business to £1,820, and from contentious suits to £140, making a total of £71,794, although no returns had been made from Hampshire and from 32 archdeaconries, while very incomplete returns had been made by surrogates in 17 dioceses. It might be taken as substantially correct that £880 was received annually by bishops for visitation fees. Now he could not see why the bishops should take this sum from the parishioners. The next item in the returns was £10,648 received by bishop's secretaries. Now it was only within the last twenty years that bishop's secretaries had appeared in the list of ecclesiastical officers and have received salaries. Then came the chancellors, who divided among themselves £8,600. The chancellors were worthy and good men, but their appointment proceeded on an altogether wrong principle. There used to be a vicar-general and a chancellor, the former being the officer to advise the bishop and the latter the judge to sit on all cases brought before him, but the offices were now united in every diocese but Canterbury, so that in any legal matter the bishop consulted his vicar-general, and if he was advised that the suit should proceed the same gentleman appears afterwards as chancellor, to try the very cause on which he had advised. That was altogether wrong in principle. The office, moreover, is in almost every instance an absolute sinecure. Take, as an illustration, the chancellor of the diocese of Chester—a very excellent person, a clergyman appointed under the old system, combining the offices of chancellor, vicar-general, and official principal. The return gave a number of cases in which fees were payable to him for the consecration of churches and collations to benefices, and honorary canonries, institutions to benefices, and licences to perpetual curacies, the duties to be performed being in each case described as "none." He also received fees for faculties for restoring or altering churches, and for the removal of corpses, and from marriage licences alone he received £603 a year. The duty performed was none, except that the licences we issued in his name and under his seal, and that all matters connected with the issue of them were under his regulation. He also received £104 from episcopal visitations, his duty being to attend the triennial visitation courts, to examine the presentments of the outgoing churchwardens, and to admit their successors. That was a very fair statement of the duties of the chancellors. They had not all the same emoluments. There was one case in which £704 was paid to a chancellor, for which no duties whatever were performed. He did not wonder that the following formula was almost universally adopted in the returns: — "Although certain of the above fees are allowed to the chancellor without any duty being required of him, it is right to add that they are regarded as an indirect way of remunerating him for learned opinions and assistance given from time to time to the bishop and clergy, and attending the bishop's visitations." But what assistance did the chancellors give to the bishops? One bishop said he did not consult the chancellor five times in the year, and only two days ago the chancellor of one of the largest dioceses in the kingdom told him he received perhaps three letters and gave as many signatures. For this he received a salary of £460 a-year. What was the business transacted by the chancellors for the sum of money which they received? Compare that business with the business transacted by the Common Law Courts, as shown by the judicial statistics for 1869, the last year for which we have returns. The proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts related to dilapidations, church-rates (now abolished), pew rights, forcibly entering churches, and other simple matters, and the number of suits of that kind in 1869 was 38. Suits for faculties, 150 for erecting or altering churches, and 24 for erecting a school, removing buildings, &c., the total number of suits which came before the 27 chancellors being 212, the greater number of which were for unopposed faculties, which in all probability were settled in a quarter of an hour. Indeed, a person of authority stated that one gentleman could discharge in six weeks the whole duties performed by those 27 judges in the course of a whole year. The Courts were principally engaged in sequestrations now that church-rates were abolished. Now, take the amount of work performed by her Majesty's judges in the three Common Law Courts. In 1869 the suits tried in town and country were—at Westminster, 1,423; at Nisi Prius, 1,421; and trials in Error, 40, making a total of 2,884; add criminal trials, 3,546, and the total number of suits and trials was 6,430. They must, however, add the business in Judges' Chambers being 194,110 cases, so that the grand total of cases was 200,540. It thus appeared that the civil and criminal proceedings in the three superior courts of common law in town and circuit and in the Judges' Chambers, exclusive of election business and attendance in the House of Lords (according to the returns), number more than 200,000. Those duties were performed by 18 common law judges, while 27 ecclesiastical judges, at an expense of nearly £9,000 a year, were occupied with the despatch of 38 suits and the issue of 174 faculties chiefly unopposed. Here was a great waste of judicial power, and another Session ought not to pass without some limit being put to such enormous abuse. Now turn to the registrars. They divided no less than £21,500; but what were the duties? Why they were often performed by deputy, the deputy paying the registrar a fixed sum of £200 a year out of the fees. Generally speaking the business of the registrar might be discharged in a few hours a week, in any case they might be performed

in eight hours a week. Then the apparitors received £1,166, derived entirely from the clergy for visitations, procurations and inductions, the duties being merely the bearing of the mace before the bishop at visitations, which was done by deputy. In the archdeaconries the same thing was repeated. The archdeacons received a certain sum, while their officials received £800 a year, their registrars £6,041, and their apparaitors £1,656. The bishops' surrogates received £14,500, and there was £2,500 paid as compensation to the proctors in the probate courts, which would expire in 1872. He wished to suggest a scheme to show how the funds might be apportioned, and what a large surplus would remain, though, of course, it was not embodied in the bill, as the question would be settled by the persons deputed to draw up the rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In the first place, the authority of the bishop would be in no way interfered with, and all vested interests were respected, all persons in the receipt of incomes continuing to receive them during ther life. He proposed at first to leave the chancellor as an honorary officer, and eventually to take away his salary, but he now proposed to assign a salary. There must be a new judge at about £3,000 a year, and about £1,000 a year for a clerk; but the £2,500 of the proctors would go a good way towards this, and about £1,200 more would enable the judge to carry out his duties; and so small a sum could easily be raised by mortgaging the fees until vacancies occur sufficient to pay off such mortgage and provide for all future expenses. He would retain the bishops' secretaries two (Canterbury and York) at £500, and twenty-five at £300 each, the salaries in every instance being substituted for fees, on the principal adopted in the common law courts. The chancellors would be two at £300, and twenty-five at £100; and the registrars, one at £800, one at £600, and twenty-five at £300. At Canterbury, a chief clerk at £200, and other clerks at £100, £100, and £80 respectively; in the registries of York, London, Chester, and Manchester, four chief clerks at £150, four at £100, and four at £80, and in the remaining twenty-two registries, a chief clerk at £150, and another at £100. There would be one provincial judge appointed. The Courts of Canterbury and York would be retained with one judge for both. He could not in any way interfere with the bishops' courts. The bishop, if he chose, could have cases tried by his chancellor, but if he preferred it he could, by sending letters of request to the Archbishop, obtain the services of the provincial judge, who would go down to the spot and there try the case. Thus the appeals would be lessened, for the appeal from the provincial judge would go straight to the Judicial Committee, whereas there was now an appeal from the Episcopal Court to the Archiepiscopal, and thence to the Judicial Committee. This estimate had been submitted to Dr. Bayford, the chief Registrar of the Court of Probate, who approved it as in every way adequate. However, the scheme was only a suggestion, and the matter would be for those who would prepare the rules and orders. It had been said that the financial basis of this scheme was insecure, as resting on the marriage licence fees, and that the marriage commissioners had reported in favour of abolishing such licences; but all that the commissioners now proposed was that the fees should be on a moderate scale, and he believed that in that case the receipts would be considerably augmented, as many persons would prefer to be married by licence. The Government derived £12,500 per annum from stamps on these licences, and it was clear that licences would continue to be needed. On an average the ecclesiastical fees might be reckoned as amounting to at least £71,000, and the whole expense of the courts proposed might rest either upon the fees from marriage licences, or upon those fees. Either was able to bear the whole weight. In conclusion, he was ready to accept any scheme that would effect the object in view. His only desire was to make the ecclesiastical courts accessible to the community and to prevent this intolerable misuse of public money.—The Archbishop of Canterbury intended to vote for the second reading, and he believed that in that course, he should be supported by a large part of the Episcopal bench. Before explaining any reasons for supporting it, he begged to correct one or two mistakes into which Lord Shaftesbury had fallen. He stated that there were a great number of sinecure offices, and urged that this was an intolerable state of things, but at the close of his speech he proposed a salary for every one of those persons. Now, though that salary was a smaller one than they received at present, if their salaries were a waste of the public money, and if they were such a nuisance to society, they surely ought to be allowed none at all. Therefore, there must be a slight mistake in the noble earl's view of those persons. With regard to the chancellors, an office held by Lord Stowell, by Dr. Lushington, and by Dr. Twiss, without its due discharge the episcopal office could not be properly carried on. While holding the see of London, he was in continual communication with Dr. Lushington, and afterwards with Dr. Twiss, on important legal matters connected with the work of the diocese, and it would have been impossible for him to dispense with their services. Apparitors were necessary officers of every court. After all, too, the salaries by fees were apparently very small. Still, he perfectly agreed that all such officers should be paid by salaries, and those salaries should be as moderate as the circumstances of the case admit. The scale which the noble earl had proposed seemed a very fair one. Were all these persons paid according to what was called in the legal profession fees for work done, they would probably receive a great deal more than the salaries now proposed. They were legal gentlemen, whose time was extremely valuable, and they should be paid, not for the length of time they gave to a case, but for the value of the opinions they gave, which opinions were absolutely necessary for the business of the diocese. As to visitation fees, he had never received such fees, nor had the Archbishop of York Whether it was right that they should be received or not would very fairly come under consideration when this matter was carried fully into operation. As to the persons invidiously called bishops' secretaries, in no sense were they simply bishops' secretaries. They were persons who, acting for the bishops, performed some public acts for which they were paid by those for whose benefit the acts were performed, and were they, like attorneys, to send in their bills for each transaction the clergy would not be likely to be satisfied with the change. Having corrected these particulars he expressed his hearty approval of the principle of the measure. It was now two years since a select committee was appointed to consider this subject. It was a very large one, consisting of the highest legal and some of the highest ecclesiastical authorities, quite competent to produce a good bill on a very difficult and intricate subject. They went into the matter with the utmost care, they considered both the noble earl's bill and his own, and the present measure is substantially the result of their deliberations. That committee itself was the result of a great many abortive attempts to cure the evils complained of. The matter, therefore, had been well ventilated. Looking at the whole matter, he thought this bill did contain a satisfactory solution of the great number of difficulties to be encountered in dealing with these courts. These courts were tedious and expensive, and according to the present arrangements, there was not sufficient provision made to secure the services of the judges. When it was proposed some years ago to abolish the jurisdiction of these courts in matrimonial and probate matters, it was objected that the result of such an arrangement would be to take away the chief means for the payment of the judge of the Court of Arches, and it was then said in answer that the country could always afford to remunerate its officials amply; but, as a matter of fact, the salary of that official was now, he believed, about £40 a year. Whether the bill provided for the payment of too large a salary was a matter which could be considered later, but there was no doubt that he had a great deal to do, and was entitled to a fair salary. With regard to the payment of those fees, the bill had followed the precedent of the Court of Chancery. Then came the question whether it was right that there should be one judge for the two provinces. The plan proposed was that the two Archbishops should concur in the nomination to the Crown of a fit person to fill the office, and not that these ancient Courts should be abolished. The question too, of course, arose whether this judge did supersede the Diocesan Courts. There was nothing in the bill to that effect. A case in the ecclesiastical courts could pass through four stages. First there was the commission, then the Diocesan Court, then the appeal to the Court of Arches, and finally the appeal to the Privy Council. But four trials would generally be allowed to be too many, and the bill provided two instead of four. It was proposed to abolish the original commission, but the Diocesan Court remained in full vigour, and if all parties concurred, an appeal could be carried direct to the Privy Council instead of being first decided by the Court of Arches. By this bill,

too, the provincial judge was authorized to go down into the district and hold his court there, thereby, of course, tending greatly to a dimunition of expense. It also proposed that the scale of fees should be entirely recast, and that fresh rules and orders should be framed for the simplication of the practice in these courts, and this was the more necessary inasmuch as there was great waste of time and money arising through the mode in which matters were now conducted in these courts.—The Bishop of Peterborough said that after the withdrawal of the 33rd clause he would not move the rejection of the bill. It had seemed to him that the 33rd clause, and those depending upon it, raised a most important question of principle never yet fully argued out in their lordships' House—the question whether the clergy were to have that protection against frivolous and vexatious prosecution which were granted to the members of other professions in this country.—Earl Beauchamp thought the proposal in the bill to repeal the restrictions in the Church Discipline Act as to the right of initiating prosecutions against clergymen would aggravate discord and promote ill feeling in many quarters. He regretted that in several important points the recommendations of the select committee were not followed in the bill now before the House. The financial basis of the present bill was in his opinion utterly unsound, and he, for one, should strongly resist any proposal to apply the funds, which were held by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for spiritual purposes to the support of ecclesiastical courts as proposed by the noble earl. It was wildly chimerical to suppose that the sums received for marriage licences would recoup the commissioners for the money they would be called upon to advance. He objected further to the proposal that persons nominated as bishops by the Crown must of necessity be consecrated by the archbishop of the province, without the laity having any right to raise objections to them on grounds affecting their faith or morals. Now that it was proposed to reform the ecclesiastical courts, it was but fair that some assurance should be given that those who preside over the Church should be as amenable to the laws of the Church as the humblest clergyman within her pale.—The Lord Chancellor was not prepared with the Bishop of Peterborough to go the length of saying that the laity ought not to possess the right of initiating proceedings against the clergy. On the contrary occasions had arisen in which the laity might have been submitted to great oppression if such a remedy were not provided for them. It might be said that there was a special remedy provided at present, but such remedy seemed calculated to produce vexation, instead of promoting harmony and peace. The laity had of late been greatly grieved by alterations made in the mode of conducting the services to which they had been accustomed. Some means ought to be provided by which such a state of things could be easily and promptly remedied. Last year the noble earl introduced a Bill on this subject, and at the same time another Bill was brought forward by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Both those measures were referred to a Select Committee, which reported in favour of a Bill very similar to that now introduced; the financial question will probably constitute the chief difficulty. He rejoiced to see that efficient Courts were to be established, because great difficulties existed at present in ordering the affairs of the Church, which ought to be conducted on legal and constitutional principles. The expense of removing a clerk in Holy Orders was enormous. He could recollect the case of a clerk who shut up his church and stuck a dunghill in the porch in order to prevent any other person from officiating. It took five or six years to remove him, at the expense of £12,000 or £13,000. Such an offence as that would by the Bill be settled in two days at least, if not in two hours. He believed, too, that the course pursued by the noble earl in giving facilities for hearing cases by consent was a most valuable part of the Bill, and ought to be more completely developed. The Bill however was not yet in such a state that a great deal of alteration would not be required in Committee, and he thought there would be very great difficulty in passing it through the other House of Parliament this session considering the state of public business there. As regards the question of finance, it would be hardly possible to maintain the marriage licence fees at the present figure, but at the same time it should be borne in mind that £12,000 were now paid for stamps, and the Government would probably not be willing to relinquish this sum. It was, at all events, desirable that we should endeavour to promote this scheme of reform by assenting to the second reading of the bill.—The Earl of Harrowby thought that if any three parishioners were to be empowered to institute a prosecution the profession of a clergyman would be the only one in the country which would be deprived of protection. Moreover, the clergy would be placed in an entirely new position. Their Lordships ought not to lose sight of this very important point. —The Bishop of Carlisle said the clauses which were withdrawn, had proposed in fact, that any three householders in a diocese should have the opportunity of prosecuting any clergyman they pleased. A power of the kind proposed to be given might affect the peace of half the dioceses in the kingdom. There was one important omission from the bill; it left untouched the position of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Any bill which altered the rest of the Ecclesiastical Court system and left altogether untouched and unimproved the present condition of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, would not give satisfaction to the country.—The Bishop of Winchester felt it would be very difficult for any bishop to introduce with any hope of success a satisfactory measure of reform, and he was therefore delighted to see a layman making laborious endeavours to remedy the evils that existed. In stating his case, however, the noble lord in several matters exaggerated to a very great degree the existing amount of evil. The chancellor was a legal adviser upon a multitude of questions which were continually arising in a diocese, and it was a matter of the utmost possible importance that there should be some one of high character and acquirements who could be consulted privately, not by the bishop only, but also by others. With respect to what were called the visitation fees received by the bishop, properly speaking no bishop received any fee at all for a visitation; but there were certain procurations and synodals, not at all in the nature of fees, but fixed charges upon different benefices in a diocese, which the holders of those benefices had to pay in the year of the bishop's visitation, and which came down from old times when the expenses of the visitation were very large; and when the bishop, instead of going with his followers to the houses of the clergy, received a composition for his travelling expenses, and which formed what was called the visitation fees. Instead of being a valuable receipt to the bishop, they were, at the most, only an ancient payment from certain benefices in mitigation of the large expenses which the bishop incurred in visitations. The work of the secretary was not new, but it was part of the work formerly performed by the registrar. The other officer was a public officer of the diocese, the main part of whose work was to help the clergy in different forms which they had to go through, and if they had to employ a solicitor for the services rendered by the secretary the expenses would amount to six times as much as the fees received by the secretary, while, without assistance, clergymen not acquainted with the law would continually be involving themselves in trouble. It was important that these matters should be understood and duly considered before the Bill was discussed in Committee. The proposed allotment of revenue between the registrar of a diocese and the chancellor of a diocese was quite a mistake. The Bill would largely increase the sum received by the registrar of the diocese of London. The office of registrar was very important in one way, and it was necessary that some one should be responsible for rightly registering the acts done, but the office was not one requiring a high degree of professional attainment. On the other hand, it was essential to make the office of chancellor such that it would attract a man of good ability, for the securing of a good chancellor was a matter of the first importance to diocesan administration. There was also another delicate point. One of the difficulties they had in dealing with those most painful cases of breaches of the moral law among the clergy was the low scale of punishment which they were empowered to award. They were now tied up in the administration of the moral discipline of a diocese by the traditional system of far too lenient sentences. A man might be guilty of repeated acts of adultery with his parishioners; he might be convicted; but the highest penalty it had been held a bishop could inflict was suspension for a certain number of years. Such a clergyman, he said, should never be allowed to go back to his parish. He complained of the whole system of considering the endowments of the Church as being made for the benefit of the clergy instead

of for the benefit of the parishioners.—The Marquis of Salisbury said the great evil complained of was that in criminal matters ecclesiastical jurisdiction was so tardy and expensive that no bishop or layman, without exposing themselves to serious loss and actual pecuniary ruin, could cause justice to be done, or remove great scandals from the centre of a parish. It was most vital to remove that evil. But it would be most mischievous to couple with that the facilitating of ecclesiastical suits against persons thought guilty of holding unsound doctrine. They knew what was the state of matters in the Church of England at the present moment. But for the preventive of expenses, the two parties in the Church of England would fly at each other's throats. He would rather go on with any evil—he would rather suffer any scandal they had now to lament, than give such fatal facility of ecclesiastical litigation. The Church of England was in that condition that made it most essential they should lose no power of restraining hostility from breaking out. By merely making litigation cheaper the noble earl would render his legislative effects abortive. He would put it to him if facilitating litigation was a great object, yet facility to retain criminals was a far greater object, and he ought to pursue those two objects separately. One he could attain certainly easily and immediately, the other could only be attained after long and most determined resistance. If he separated the two objects, his belief was he would speedily attain great and important results.

The Bill was then read a second time.

June 12.—*Lunacy Regulation Acts Amendment.*—A bill by the Lord Chancellor was read a first time.

The Treaty of Washington.—Earl Russell moved an address praying her Majesty not to ratify any convention for the settlement of the Alabama claims on the basis of any other rules than the rules of international law in force at the time of the late civil war in America. He argued that by the recent Treaty with the United States England paid tribute in order to secure peace. After entering at length into a detailed narrative of the circumstances under which the Alabama escaped from Liverpool, the opinion of Sir R. Palmer and other law officers of the Crown, and the diplomatic correspondence which, as Foreign Secretary, he conducted with Mr. Adams and the American Government, he contended that there had been no want of due diligence on the part of the Government of that day, and that nothing had been done by Great Britain in contravention of municipal and international law. He cited the opinions of Lords Palmerston, Clarendon, and other authorities, in regard to the American claims to compensation.—Earl Granville vindicated the course adopted in the matter of this Treaty. The Government had always consistently refused to admit the liability to the "Alabama" claims, but had as steadily offered to refer the question to arbitration.—Lord Derby hoped Earl Russell would be satisfied without pressing his motion to a division: the bargain was not wholly satisfactory, but it would not do at this stage to break off the Treaty.—Earl De Grey, as one of the High Commissioners who had negotiated the convention, vindicated the Treaty and the course pursued by the Commissioners. He believed the result would be that other Governments would bind themselves by the rules there laid down, a result which would benefit no power more than Great Britain.—Lord Cairns said the motion could not possibly be assented to; the Treaty having been signed by Plenipotentiaries possessing the powers entrusted to the High Commissioners of this country, was now, in honour and honesty, as binding as if the ratification had been actually discharged. He then proceeded to criticise the wording of the arbitration clause in the Treaty. Who was to say what was "due diligence?" "due diligence" itself meant nothing. What was "due diligence?" as between man and man was not "due diligence" as between power and power. The rule was to be a rule of international law, and if there was one thing more clear than another in international law, it was this, that as between two countries, it is no excuse where an international obligation has been broken for one country to say to another that its municipal law did not confer upon its executive sufficient power to enable it to fulfil its international duty. Suppose the United States, in applying this retrospective law, should say that the Government of 1863 or 1864 were bound to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, the arming, or equipment of any vessel of this kind, they might also say, "Do not tell us what the law of your country was. Do not tell us that you require clear evidence to be brought before you of the object for which the ship was intended before you could detain her. You have admitted that you were required to maintain due diligence, and by that standard, and that standard alone, you must be judged." Here was a serious blot in these terms of arbitration. Why again was "due diligence" spoken of in the 1st rule but not in the 2nd? This was not the time for Parliament to pronounce on the merits or demerits of this Treaty, but it had been most carelessly and unguardedly entered on.—The Lord Chancellor in the course of a speech in vindication of the Treaty, said the second clause could not be understood otherwise than as referring to belligerent vessels cruising against a friendly state, and not to anything like the export of arms, so much talked of lately, and about which there could be no doubt but that it was not a breach of neutrality.—Lord Salisbury said the Treaty seemed to have been a concession by this country expressly made to calm down "the susceptibilities of the American people." The calming those susceptibilities (*valeat quantum*) was all we had got by it, while on the other hand, we had sacrificed our own dignity and the rights of neutrals.—The Duke of Argyll regretted that Lord Cairns had supplied his high authority for use against us in the Arbitration Court under the Treaty.—Earl Russell observed that if we went on increasing our neutral obligations in this way, it would become safer to be belligerent than neutral.—Earl Russell's motion was then negatived without a division.

The *Trust Funds Investment Bill* was read the third time and passed.

June 13.—The *Irish Land Act, and Lord Justice Christian.*—Lord Greville called attention to the judgment recently delivered in the Court of Appeal in Ireland by Lord Justice Christian, involving a point of great importance in connection with the Act of last year. After quoting a newspaper report of the Lord Justice's observations, he said—The first clause of the Act passed last year enacted that the Ulster tenant right customs should be legal, but now the Court of the highest Court of Appeal in Ireland had declared they were not legal.—The Lord Chancellor had now received a letter from the learned Lord Justice, who, speaking of the report of his remarks said:—"It i not a report, but rather a travesty of what I was supposed to have said. The strong expressions which I may have used with reference to one subject have been transferred and carried to a totally different subject, and the whole report, as it appears in the newspapers, is unintelligible, and does not contain a single word that I expressed." Under these circumstances, it would, of course, be impossible for him to express an opinion on the remarks stated to have been made by the learned judge. With regard to the subject-matter itself he must observe that no decision had been given to the effect that the Ulster custom was not protected and rendered valid by the Act of last year. Indeed, supposing the learned Judge to have expressed such an opinion as was described by the noble lord, it would simply amount to this—that there was a difference of opinion between him and the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. Unless the tenantry carried the case further, there would be no means of obtaining a legal decision as to the construction to be placed on the Act, and until the Government knew what the actual construction was, he did not see how any legislative measure could be brought forward with reference to the subject.

The *Arrears of Privy Council Appeals.*—Lord Westbury again called attention to the arrears of appeals before the Privy Council, the state of business amounting to a denial of justice in the final Court of Appeal to many millions of her Majesty's subjects. A positive pledge was last session given on the part of the Government that a remedy should be applied, but nothing had been done—why, no man could tell. The foreign and colonial appeals had now increased from 300 to 386, exclusive of patent, ecclesiastical, and other business. He hoped the Lord Chancellor would, within ten days, bring in a bill to constitute a new tribunal in the manner proposed last year, by adding two puisne judges from Westminster-hall to the appellate tribunal, which might then sit continuously until the present heap of arrears was reduced to manageable limits. If he could not obtain what he sought from the justice of the Government, he should, like the widow in Scripture, seek to obtain it by importunity.—The Lord Chancellor admitted that the colonists had just reason to complain of the want of a well-organised Court of Appeal, that the Government had done

their best; but that the state of public business last year prevented the passing of the Bills brought in for the reform of the Appellate Court and the judicature. This year a bill for the general reform of the appellate jurisdiction was in the hands of the Attorney-General, and until it passed it was intended to continue the sittings of the Judicial Committee. At the same time the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords did not give entire satisfaction, and he trusted to be able to carry some measure by which these two great Courts of Appeal should render each other mutual assistance, and give uniformity to the law. The Government had not been behind hand in law reform; there had been the Bankruptcy Bill, which had effected a great improvement, the Irish Land Bill, and the Education Bill. The necessity for legislation had grown up unexpectedly, the Indian appeals had increased suddenly, and the constitution of the courts which had worked for thirty years had wholly broken down. Five of its best members were unable from age so to sit. In conclusion, he indicated that a temporary measure was in preparation enabling two judges to sit continuously on Indian appeals until the arrears were reduced.—Lord Cairns could not agree in the satisfaction incidentally expressed by the Lord Chancellor as to the working of the English Bankruptcy Bill. The Government measures promised in the Queen's Speech had not yet been presented. If the Appellate Tribunal were to sit continuously for the whole of a judicial year, it was doubtful whether the eighty-six causes now set down for hearing could be disposed of. It was now so late in the session that unless the Government brought in a bill within ten days it would be tantamount to saying they were indifferent to the subject.—Lord Romilly said that if the reform of the Judicial Committee was to be postponed until the passing of a general measure as to the whole appellate jurisdiction of this country, the subject would outlive many of their lordships.—The Lord Chancellor promised that he would alter the judicial tribune itself, so as to enable it to sit continuously. Some temporary measure was required for enabling the Judicial Committee to dispose of that business which was essential for the administration of justice over a large part of the world.—He would take care that steps should be taken to facilitate the hearing of the Indian appeals. How the Court should be constituted was a matter that would require consideration.—Lord Westbury gave notice that if some measure were not soon taken he would move an address to the Crown on the subject.

The *Irish Land Act—Ulster Tenant-Right.*—Lord Cairns introduced a bill enacting that in the case of any proceedings under the Landed Estates Court Act the rights of tenants under the Act of last session should remain valid, although they might not be specified or referred to in the conveyance.—The Lord Chancellor thanked Lord Cairns for introducing the bill. After what had occurred it was desirable that all doubt should be removed, and the sooner this was done the better. On the part of the Government he should be happy to assist in passing the bill.

The *Union of Benefices Bill.*—The Bishop of Exeter moved the second reading. Earl Powis opposed the bill, which was thrown out without a division.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

June 9.—The *Army Regulation Bill.*—Committee.—Consideration again adjourned.

The Treaty of Washington.—Sir Roundell Palmer asked the first Lord of the Treasury whether the Second Rule in Article VI. of the Treaty of Washington was understood by Government as prohibiting the use of neutral ports or waters for the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms to a belligerent only when those acts are done for the service of a vessel cruising or carring on war, or intended to cruise or carry on war, against another belligerent; and not when military supplies or arms are exported for the use of a belligerent Power from neutral ports or waters in the ordinary course of commerce; whether any steps had been taken by the Government to ascertain that the rule in question is understood by the Government of the United States in the same limited sense, and, if so, with what result; and whether it is intended, in any communications which may be addressed to foreign Governments with a view to the general adoption of this rule, to guard against its being accepted or understood in any larger sense.—Mr. Gladstone was in a position to answer the first part of the question in the affirmative. In answer to the second part, the Government had an opportunity of communicating with Lord De Grey, and with the right hon. gentleman opposite, and with Professor Bernard on the subject, who had all of them given the fullest assurance that the understanding referred to in the first part of the question is that of the United States in reference to this matter; and, further, that the Government had been able to communicate with General Schenck who had arrived in this country as the representative of the United States, who was a member of the Joint High Commission—and who had informed the Government that such was his understanding also of the meaning of the rule in question; and, indeed, they had been told by that gentleman that the President of the United States himself understood the rule in that sense, and that the latter would himself be the first not only to admit and allow, but to contend for that construction of the rule in question. With regard to the third part of the question, Mr. Fish, the United States' Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who was also one of the Commissioners, had expressed an opinion that it would be advantageous if the two Governments were to make a joint declaration which should place the meaning of this rule beyond all chance of misconstruction. Communications had been entered into between some of the British Commissioners and some of the United States' Commissioners and other distinguished authorities in America on the subject, and they had come to the conclusion that it is impossible to entertain the slightest doubt but that the meaning to be attached to the terms of the Treaty is that which the contracting parties themselves attach to them.

The *Game Laws.*—Mr. Bruce, owing to the lateness of the time, and press of business, withdrew the Government Bill, and would move next session for a select committe.

The *Army Regulation Bill*—Committee.—Mr. Cardwell stated that the Government would not insist on any part of the Bill except the abolition of purchase and the transfer of the militia and volunteers from the lords lieutenant to the Crown. The Bill was subsequently considered further in committee.

The *Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal Bill.*—The motion for committee was opposed by Mr. Newdegate, but carried by 176 to 91. An adverse motion by Mr. Charley having then been negatived, Mr. Charley proposed that in lieu of the Bill as it stood the 24th section of the Catholic Emancipation Act should be repealed and the operation of the Bill confined to Ireland. The Attorney General and Dr. Ball argued against this proposal which was rejected by 124 to 45. The preamble was then agreed to, and the House resumed.

The *Corrupt Practices Act Amendment Bill* was read the third time and passed.

The *Courts of Justice (Additional Site) Bill* passed through committee.

Lord Justice Christian and the Irish Land Act.—Sir J. Gray, Mr. Maguire, and Mr. Pim, asked if the Government meant to bring in a bill to give legal effect to the intention of the measure.—Mr. Gladstone said he had seen a letter from the Lord Justice in which he denied that the reports represented truly what he had really said. The Solicitor-General for Ireland thought there was no short-hand note, but the Government would endeavour so far as they could with propriety to ascertain the precise decisions given by the Lord Justice. The opinions attributed to the Lord Justice were at variance with the other decisions on the matter, and with the opinions of the best commentators on the Act. It would have been strange if a Legislature possessing so much legal talent had made such a blunder. He was not convinced that there was anything to be remedied; but he would say, that the Government would not fail to do anything that might be requisite to give effect to the intentions of Parliament in passing the Bill.

The *Army Regulation Bill*—Committee.—Consideration again adjourned.

June 15.—The *Life Assurance Companies Act* (1870) *Amendment Bill* was read a second time.

Mr. William H. Marshall, solicitor, of Durham, has been appointed agent to the North Durham Liberal Association.

A paper will we read at a meeting of the Law Amendment Society in the Adelphi, on Monday evening next, at 8 o'clock, by John Westlake, Esq., "on the interpretation of the Extradition Acts as affecting political crime." W. Vernon Harcourt, Esq., Q.C., M.P. will take the chair.

OBITUARY.

MR. W. P. HALE.

Mr. William Palmer Hale, barrister-at-law, died at Westbourne Park-road on the 4th of June, at the age of 47 years. He was the eldest son of the late Ven. W. H. Hale, Archdeacon of London, who died on the 28th November, 1870. Mr. W. P. Hale, was of Trinity-hall, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1848, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple on the 7th June, 1852. He was a member of the Home Circuit, and attended the Herts and St. Alban's sessions. He also practised for a few years at the Bombay Bar.

MR. R. EASTWOOD.

Mr. Richard Eastwood, solicitor, of Burnley, Lancashire, died at Morecambe, where he had been residing for the benefit of sea-air, on the 29th of May. Mr. Eastwood was a native of Burnley, and was the son of Mr. Henry Eastwood, head-keeper to the late Peregrine Edward Towneley, Esq., of Towneley, Lancashire. He studied law with Mr. Anthony Buck, a solicitor in Burnley, and after passing his examination and being admitted an attorney in 1824, he became a partner with Mr. Buck, and the firm of "Buck & Eastwood" was one of the best-known legal firms of Burnley for some thirty or forty years. Messrs. Buck & Eastwood jointly filled the offices of Clerk to the Magistrates of Burnley, and clerk to the local gas and water companies. Mr. Buck died about ten years ago, and after some time Mr. Eastwood entered into partnership with Messrs. A. B. Creeke and J. B. Sandy, which continued till his death. Early in his career, Mr. Eastwood was appointed legal adviser and agent to the Towneley estates, an office which he held for many years, both under P. E. Towneley, Esq. and his son Colonel Charles Towneley, the present owner. Mr. Eastwood was well known in the sporting world, in conjunction with his principal, Mr. Towneley, as a breeder of high-class horses for the turf, and his horse Butterfly won the Oaks several years ago, His name is also identified in agricultural circles with the rearing of the celebrated stock of shorthorns of the "Butterfly" breed. Mr. Eastwood was twice married—first to a Miss Russell, by whom he leaves a surviving daughter, who is married; and secondly to Miss Ann Grimshaw, sister of Thomas Grimshaw, Esq., of Piers Clough, Rossendale, by whom he had one child. The remains of the deceased gentleman were interred at Thornleyholme, in the burial-ground of the Roman Catholic Chapel, on the 2nd of June.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The eleventh annual festival of this society was held on Tuesday evening, at the Albion, Aldersgate-street, the chair being occupied (for the second time) by the Lord Chief Baron Kelly. Amongst the visitors present were:—Mr. Wm. Digby Seymour, Q.C.; Mr. Serjeant Parry; Mr. L. B. Clarence (bar); Mr. M. C. Buszard (bar); Mr. J. S. Torr, London; Mr. E. F. Burton; Rev. John Thain Davidson; Mr. J. H Mackenzie, London; Mr. E. Banner, Liverpool; Mr. W. H. Guest, Manchester; Mr. H. A. Deane, London; Mr. E. Bromley, London; Mr. Sidney Smith; Mr. E. Hedger; Mr. J. W. Baillie, Edinburgh; Mr. J. D. Thomson, London; Mr. T. Hamlin, Wrington; Mr. J. B. Monckton, London; Mr. C. H. Gates, Lutterworth; Mr. W. Hine-Haycock; Mr. J. Fluker, London; Mr. J. M. Shugar, Tring; Mr. A. W. Sadgrove, London; Mr. C. F. Tagart, London; Mr. Rowland, Croydon; Mr. F. Buckland, Mr. J. J. Merriman, &c., &c.

Grace having been sung by Miss Banks, Madame Osborne Williams, Mr. Nordblom, and Mr. F. Bevan, Mr. W. Ganz, presiding at the pianoforte,

The CHAIRMAN gave the usual loyal toasts, which were received in the accustomed manner.

"The Army, Navy, and Volunteers," was the next toast, in proposing which, the CHAIRMAN said that he himself came of a race of soldiers, although he had followed a peaceful occupation; he was not sure, however, whether some might not demur at the law being a peaceful occupation. He was old enough, he said, to recollect the time when Europe was convulsed with war from Scandinavia to the Pillars of Hercules, but through all those troubles the British army and the British fleet had preserved their country in honour and in safety, by their unbroken series of glorious victories. He believed the same thing would happen again if occasion should arise, which, he sincerely hoped, would not be the case, and he was confident that not only the army and navy, but the volunteers, would distinguish themselves, and obtain the applause of all foreign nations, as they had already won the respect and confidence of their countrymen. He regretted to find that no representatives of the army and navy were present; he called on Mr. L. B. Clarence to respond on behalf of the volunteers.

Mr. CLARENCE said the Lord Chief Baron, in calling on him to respond to that toast, had called up a voice from the ranks. He did not know how it could be that no one of higher rank in the volunteer army was called upon to speak for the volunteers. One of his neighbours had just suggested that it might be because the rank and file were the substance of every army and the officers a mere subsidiary fringe: however that might be, he found himself obliged to speak *de profundis*, a phrase which was the more appropriate because the corps to which he had the honour to belong was sometimes called the "Devil's Own" (a laugh). His Lordship had done the volunteers the honour of coupling them with that regular army and navy which had fought the country's battles with such glorious success. It was not for him to say whether the volunteers deserved the honour. Of late it had been the fashion to disparage the volunteers, and to say that they were merely playing at soldiers. There might be some truth in that, but though it would not become him to boast, this he might say, that he believed a thorough revival was taking place among them. They were recognising that—unless they did really maintain themselves, he did not say in as efficient a condition as the regular army, but in such a condition of efficiency that in case of invasion they might be depended upon as a reliable support to the regular army—they were allowing the country to lean upon a broken reed. (Hear). Speaking for his own corps (and he believed he might speak for the whole force), he believed that the volunteers were desirous to spare nothing, in readiness to subject themselves to strict discipline or in foregoing their personal convenience in any other way, in order to render themselves what they professed to be. (Hear, hear). It was to be hoped that they would never be actually called on, but should that emergency arise, he confidently hoped they would be found prepared. He believed the date of the battle of Dorking was not fixed; but if an enemy should attack our shores, and the Channel fleet should fail to stop them *in transitu*, the volunteers would not be found wanting.

Mr. SERJT. PARRY proposed the health of "Her Majesty's Judges." He remarked that in the presence of so distinguished a member of the bench he had a somewhat difficult task to perform, especially when he considered that at this time of day there was no need to talk of the integrity and purity of the English bench, or of its learning and wisdom, for these were well known facts. (Hear.) Perhaps what was not always sufficiently remembered was the effect which the administration of justice by our superior judges had upon the social life of the country. He knew of no grander sight than that of a great trial, presided over by a great judge, in the presence of counsel, of the other branch of the profession, solicitors and attorneys, and in the presence of the public and of the press. Wherever one of her Majesty's judges went, there travelled with him impartiality, a strong sense of justice, and a desire to arrive at the truth, and the peculiar institution of circuits which prevailed in this country (and which he heard there was some talk of abolishing in order to create a totally different species of tribunal) had always seemed to him of the highest advantage to the nation. The consequence was, that into every part of the country the principles and practice of law, justice and rigid impartiality, were brought home to all classes of society, and thus he believed that the judges were as much educators of the people as the schoolmaster himself. He should be sorry to speak ill of other countries, particularly at a time of foreign distress like the present, but if there was one difference between England and foreign countries more marked than another, it was the complete confidence which was here felt in the administration of justice. On the part of the bar he wished to express how extremely sensible they were of the uniform courtesy of the judges. He well recollected many years ago his first nonsuit, which occasioned him a sleepless night, and he could not help thinking he had been very hardly treated by

the presiding judge, he even fancied that judge must have a personal hostility to him. (Laughter.) However, after some long interval (for briefs were then to him like angels visits) he had another brief, a thing which after that nonsuit he had feared would never come to him again, and this time the same learned judge directed a verdict in his favour. Thereupon his feelings were entirely altered. Since that time he had more experience of her Majesty's judges, and all that he had seen had only served to convince him that, whatever hasty conclusions might be pronounced, the more intimate anyone's experience of the bench, the more strongly he must become convinced of the impartiality and courtesy, which every one met at their hands, even down to the lowest or youngest member of the profession. (Hear, hear.) He coupled the toast with the name of their chairman, the Lord Chief Baron.

The CHAIRMAN, in returning thanks, said, that, speaking of course impersonally, the enconiums passed upon her Majesty's judges were by no means undeserved. They were ready to bestow the labours of a lifetime upon the discharge of their duty, and that at a period of life when sometimes they might think themselves entitled to enjoy repose. He could assure his audience that their days, aye, and sometimes most of their nights, were passed in toil and anxiety in order to enable them to do justice to those suitors who came before them. For himself he had gone through a longer career at the bar than any man now living, although he had been but a short time a judge, but his labours and anxieties at the bar, and they had been not a few, were as nothing compared with those which had come upon him since he had had the honour of a seat upon the bench. It must be borne in mind that their labours were not confined to the administration of justice in London, where they were surrounded by so many distinguished men at the bar, but they had also to travel into the remotest parts of the country where there was not the same entire and intimate knowledge of the nature of the duties to be performed, and there sometimes they had a more difficult task to satisfy and reconcile disappointed suitors. His long experience at the bar had convinced him that England was greatly indebted to the labours of that body of men whose interests were sought by the association, in aid of which they were met together. Their truthfulness, candour, knowledge, industry, but above all the good faith with which they came and stated their cases to counsel, were such as always enabled him to feel that if he could not do justice to his cause it would be his own fault. Such were the feelings with which he had passed through a long and somewhat troubled career at the bar, and those feelings still continued. So long as the bench of judges were supported by a bar, such as the bar now was, and whilst they were assisted and supported by such a body of men as the attorneys and solicitors of the present day, the task of the judges of England was infinitely facilitated. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. J. S. TORR said he had much pleasure in proposing the health of the Bar, especially as amongst them were to be found some of the most liberal supporters of the society. He was very glad that efforts were now being made to establish a Law University, and none the less credit was due to the Bar for their able support of this movement, because it originated in the solicitors' branch of the profession. During the last three or four years it had been usual at these meetings to comment on the project for a fusion of the two branches of the profession, but so far it had resulted in nothing, and he believed, at any rate in the present generation, it could result in nothing, because the training and education of the present members of both branches were such as would not qualify them for discharging unaccustomed duties. He believed that even at this moment if the right of advocacy in superior courts were accorded to solicitors very few indeed would take advantage of it, but there would be a repetition of what was already seen in the inferior courts, where a select few solicitors devoted themselves principally to advocacy, and monopolised all the business in that department, whilst again others devoted themselves more to the preparation and getting up of cases.

Mr. DIGBY SEYMOUR, Q.C., in responding, said—It was the habit of some people to contrast the present condition of the English bar with the history of its predecessors, but for his part he believed that either in equity or in common law, in Bankruptcy or in the Court of Admiralty, the Probate or Ecclesiastical Courts, wherever the voice of the English bar was heard, they would be equal to any occasion on which they were called to do justice to themselves and the public. In criticising the condition of the Bar at the present day it must be remembered that the great occasions which elicited the grand power of an Erskine and a Brougham, the liberty of the Press, the unshackling of the slave, the freedom of commerce, were no longer topics of discussion. Those men were found equal to the great occasions on which their powers were called forth, and the Bar in modern times were equally prepared to discharge their duty when, as on the present occasion arose. He rejoiced to be present on such an occasion, and to lend what aid he could to the noble institution whose cause they were met to support, for he never knew an association so pure in its objects, so benevolent in its principles, so useful and practical in its charities, as the Solicitors' Benevolent Association.

The CHAIRMAN then rose to propose the toast of the evening—"The Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and long may prosperity attend it." It was now just eight years since it was first his good fortune to be present on such an occasion. He believed he was the first member of the English Bar to whom the compliment was paid of requesting him to take the chair. He had already had occasion to remark that for forty-two years of his life he had been a member of the English Bar, and in constant, intimate, confidential association with the attorneys and solicitors of England. They might well believe, therefore, that on that occasion he took the chair with the sincerest feelings of gratification. He then ventured to point out that they had not brought themselves in any way into communication with the heads of the profession to which they belonged, and he suggested to them they should take some means of making it known that such an association existed. This was done, and he had the satisfaction of now finding upon looking through the records of past years, that seven meetings out of eight had been presided over by one or the other of the law or equity judges of England. He also had the satisfaction of knowing from communication with them on the subject, that they took the deepest interest in the success and prosperity of the association. Indeed, if they were destined to live long enough he believed there was not a man upon the bench who would not rejoice to fill the position in which he now found himself—taking the chair at such a meeting, and addressing such an assembly, for the same purpose, and with the same hopes and anxieties which he felt at that moment. At the time he had spoken of the association was only beginning its course. At that time they only dispensed a very small and almost insignificant sum in administering to the want and necessities of the less fortunate members of the profession, and of their families; and although those sums had increased very rapidly, he wished he could say in geometrical proportion, he lamented to see that even now the society was not in the position in which he hoped to see it before many years, when they would be able to say to all deserving but unfortunate members of the profession, or to their widows and families—all that you need, all that you deserve, you shall have when you apply to this institution. Some causes were at work which perhaps might account for what he looked upon with regret, namely, that although the society was possessed of £20,000 of capital, there were but some 2,000 and odd members of the association out of a total number in the profession of between 11,000 and 12,000. Their position therefore was not that which eight years ago he hoped it would have been by this time, but still a great deal had been done to make the association and its objects known, the members having been in communication with the bar and also with the bench. However, much still remained to be done, and perhaps one cause amongst others, why the state of the exchequer was not more flourishing was, that from some cause or other of late years the profession of solicitors had not been by any means so prosperous and successful as it deserved to be. Some people were of opinion that this arose from a larger increase in the humbler classes of the population in proportion to the more prosperous and wealthier classes. Again, it was said that the establishment of county courts had taken away a great deal of business from the superior courts of law and equity, and hence the condition of a solicitor was by no means what it was some twenty or thirty years ago. He could not help thinking, however, that the present state of the profession arose in some measure from that want of a general system of education to which Mr. Torr had alluded, and he believed if they could contrive amongst themselves, including in that term the entire profession of law, solicitors, counsel, and

judges, to establish a system of general education and a corporate body, something like the great universities of this country, to which all members of the profession might belong each in his vocation, and which body might determine the rights and claims of each individual either to become a member of the bar, or to maintain this or that character and condition amongst the attorneys and solicitors of the country;—if there were some general system, not a Republican form of government (laughter) but a system in which every member should have a voice, and that should educate men as solicitors were educated, at once in law and equity, and for the other subsidiary branches, he believed at no great distance of time a system would be established under which all classes of this great profession would prosper according to their merits and deserts. Among such a vast number of people there must be, of course, many who were not blessed with such abilities as would entitle them to success; there must be men who from misfortune, not to be averted by any precaution, or by any efforts of their own, would fall into difficulties, and would thus require the assistance and support of their fellow men; but these would be exceptional cases, and he hoped that aged as he was, he might yet live to see the day when a system would be established under which by the intimate relations subsisting between that and some great educational body, persons might pass through all the earlier stages and steps of their educational course until they might possibly attain the very highest honours of the profession. Whilst, however, looking forward in this way they must not forget what was the primary and principal object of this institution, namely, that of offering relief to the unsuccessful members of the profession, which they must look for in vain from any other quarter. Keeping this in view, a great deal might still be done by associating with the bar and with the bench, and by inviting from time to time the most distinguished members of the one body and the other to come forward, and not merely to preside on such occasions, but to assist in other ways in furthering the objects of the association. He looked forward to the time when the funds would be double and treble what they now were, and when they would really be able to extend the blessings of real charity to all members of the profession who might require their aid. During the next twelve months he would recommend every member whenever he had the opportunity of conversing with another member of the profession, no matter whether he was attorney, solicitor, barrister, judge, or Lord Chancellor, to refer to the association, saying that relief had been afforded to unfortunate members, but that more assistance was required—in plain English, ask them to put down their money and help in every possible way. He would advise them all to do all they could both in court and out of court, in other words, before such a meeting as that, at the meeting, and after the meeting, to further the interests of the institution, in this way even the youngest present might find means of aiding the objects which they all had in view. In conclusion he might say that the association might always rely on him to do at all times, when it fell within his power, everything he could to assist the objects of this society. (Applause.)

The SECRETARY (Mr. Eiffe) here read the list of subscriptions and donations, amounting in the whole to between £400 and £500, and announced that there were fifty-four new annual subscribers.

Mr. E. F. BURTON, in proposing the health of the Chairman, alluded to rumours which were afloat as to proposed changes in our judicial system; proposals had been made by members of the House of Commons (who knew nothing whatever of the subject). There were proposals for an unlimited county-court jurisdiction; there were proposals again for local tribunals of three individuals, including one merchant and the registrar, and in case the merchant residing in some small country town—(laughter)—or the other member should find it inconvenient to attend, the registrar might do the work himself (laughter). Then there were proposals for doing away with the time-honoured Courts of Common Pleas, Exchequer, and Queen's Bench. He hoped that such an experiment would never be tried, for he considered the present system of the administration of justice, one of the bulwarks of the country, and he should much regret to find the title of their chairman altered from that of Lord Chief Baron to that of President of Sub-Division Court No. 3. He remembered the Lord Chief Baron at the bar, and felt pleased to think that he, at any rate, would never favour rash change and innovation.

The LORD CHIEF BARON, in acknowledging the toast, said that whatever might be his future title, and whether he remained Lord Chief Baron, or became President of Sub-Division Court No. 3—(a laugh)—whether he remained on the bench or retired into private life, at any rate his identity would remain to him, and he should never lose his deep interest in the profession to which his whole life and his whole energies had been devoted.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

On Tuesday, the 13th inst., the question was No. 478, legal:—"A spinster conveys, by marriage settlement, her real estate to a trustee to the use of herself and her heirs until the solemnization of the marriage, and thereafter to such uses as she should, notwithstanding coverture, by deed or will appoint. Can she execute the power of appointment by will made after the settlement, but before the solemnization of the marriage?" Mr. Lane opened the debate in the affirmative, and Mr. Indermaur followed in the negative. The society decided in the affirmative by a slight majority.

COURT PAPERS.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

SITTINGS AFTER TRINITY TERM, 1871.

LORD CHANCELLOR.

Lincoln's Inn.

Tues., June 20	The First Seal.—Appeals.
Wednesday .21	Petns. and apps.
Thursday ..22	Appeals.
Friday 23	App. mtns. & apps.
Monday 26	Appeals.
Tuesday 27	
Wednesday .28	
Thursday ..29	The Second Seal.—Appeals.
Friday 30	App. mtns. & apps.
Monday, July 3	Appeals.
Tuesday 4	
Wednesday.. 5	
Thursday .. 6	The Third Seal.—Appeals.
Friday..... 7	App. mtns. & apps.
Monday 10	Appeals.
Tuesday 11	
Wdnesday ..12	
Thursday ..13	The Fourth Seal.—Appeals.
Friday 14	App. mtns. & apps.
Monday 17	Appeals.
Tuesday....18	
Wednesday..19	
Thursday ..20	The Fifth Seal.—Appeals.
Friday 21	App. mtns. & apps.
Monday 24	Appeals.
Tuesday 25	
Wednesday .26	Petitions & apps.
Thursday ..27	Appeals.
Friday 28	The Sixth Seal.—App. mtns. & apps.

LORDS JUSTICES.

Lincoln's Inn.

Tues., June 20	The First Seal. Appeals.
Wednesday .21	Appeals.
Thursday ..22	
Friday..... 23	Appeal motions.
Saturday ..24	Petns. in lunacy, bankrupt apps., & appeal petitions.
Monday 26	Appeals.
Tuesday 27	
Wednesday .28	
Thursday ..29	The Second Seal.—Appeals.
Friday..... 30	Appeal motions.
Satur., July 1	Petns. in lunacy, bk. appeals, and app. ptns.
Monday 3	Appeals.
Tuesday.... 4	
Wednesday.. 5	
Thursday .. 6	The Third Seal.—Appeals.
Friday 7	Appeal motions.
Saturday .. 8	Petns. in lunacy, bkrpt. apps., and appeal petns.
Monday 10	Appeals.
Tuesday....11	
Wednesday .12	
Thursday ..13	The FourthSeal.—Appeals.
Friday, ...14	Appeal motions.
Saturday ..15	Petns. in lunacy bkrt. apps., and app. petitions.
Monday 17	Appeals.
Tuesday....18	
Wednesday .19	
Thursday ..20	The Fifth Seal.—Appeals.
Friday 21	Appeal motions.
Saturday ..22	Petitns. in lunacy, bkrpt. apps., and app petns.
Monday 24	Appeals.
Tuesday 25	
Wednesday .26	
Thursday ..27	
Friday 28	The Sixth Seal.—Appeal motions.
Saturday ..29	Ptns. in lunacy, bkrpt. apps., & app. petns.

MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Chancery-lane.

Tues., June 20	The First Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Wednesday..21	General paper.
Thursday ..22	
Friday 23	
Saturday ..24	Petns., sht. causes, adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 26	General paper.
Tuesday 27	
Wednesday..28	
Thursday ..29	The Second Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 30	General paper.
Satur., July 1	Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 3	General paper.
Tuesday 4	
Wednesday 5	
Thursday .. 6	The Third Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday..... 7	General paper.
Saturday .. 8	Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 10	General paper.
Tuesday 11	
Wednesday .12	
Thursday ..13	The FourthSeal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday.....14	General paper.
Saturday ..15	Petns., sht. causes, adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 17	General paper.
Tuesday 18	
Wednesday .19	
Thursday ..20	The Fifth Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 21	General paper.
Saturday ..22	Ptns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.

Monday 24	
Tuesday 25	General paper.
Wednesday 26	
Thursday ..27	
Friday 28	The Sixth Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..29	Remaining motns. petitions, & adj. sums.

V. C. SIR RICHARD MALINS.
Lincoln's Inn.

Tues., June 20	The First Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Wednesday..21	
Thursday ..22	General paper.
Friday ..23..	Mtns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..24	Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Monday....26	
Tuesday....27	General paper.
Wednesday .28	
Thursday ..29	The Second Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday.....30..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Satur., July 1	Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Monday 3	
Tuesday 4	General paper.
Wednesday.. 5	
Thursday .. 6	The Third Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday .... 7..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 8	Sht. causes, adj. sums. & gen. pa.
Monday 10	
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday..12	
Thursday ..13	The FourthSeal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday ....14..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..15	Sht. caus., adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Monday 17	
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .19	
Thursday ..20	The Fifth Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday ....21..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..22	Sht. caus., adj. sums.,& gen. pa.
Monday 24	
Tuesday 25	General paper.
Wednesday .26	
Thursday ..27	
Friday.....28	The Sixth Seal.—Motions.
Saturday ..29	Remaining mtns., petns. & adj.sums.

V. C. SIR JAMES BACON.
Lincoln's Inn.

Tues., June 20	The First Seal.—Mtns. & adj. sums.
Wednesday..21	
Thursday ..22	General paper.
Friday 23	
Saturday ..24	Ptns. Sht. caus., & general paper.
Monday ....26..	In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 27	General paper.
Wednesday .28	
Thursday ..29	TheSecond Seal.—Mtns. & adj. sums.
Friday ....30..	General paper.
Satur., July 1	Ptns., sht. caus., & general paper.
Monday .... 3..	In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday.... 4	General paper.
Wednesday . 5	
Thursday .. 6	The Third Seal.—Mtns. & adj. sums.
Friday..... 7..	General paper.
Saturday .. 8	Ptns., sht. caus., & general paper.
Monday ....10..	In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .12	
Thursday ..13	The Fourth Seal.—Mtns. & adj. sums.
Friday ....14..	General paper.
Saturday ..15	Ptns., sht. caus., & general paper
Monday ....17..	In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .19	
Thursday ..20	The Fifth Seal.—Mtns. & adj. sums.
Friday.....21..	General paper.
Saturday ..22	Petns., sht. caus., & general paper.
Monday ....24..	In Bankruptcy.
Tuesday....25	
Wednesday .26	General paper.
Thursday ..27	
Friday 28	The Sixth Seal.—Mtns. & adj. sums.
Saturday .. 3	Remaining mtns., petitions, and adj. sums.,

V. C. WICKENS.
Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday....20	The First Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Wednesday .21	
Thursday ..22	General paper.
Friday.....23..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..24	Short causes and general paper.
Monday 26	
Tuesday 27	General paper.
Wednesday .28	
Thursday ..29	TheSecondSeal.—Mtns. & gen. pa
Friday.....30..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Satur., July 1	Short causes and general paper.
Monday 3	
Tuesday.... 4	General paper.
Wednesday . 5	
Thursday .. 6	The Third Seal.—Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday .... 7..	Ptns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 8	Short causes, and general paper.
Monday 10	
Tuesday....11	General paper.
Wednesday .12	
Thursday ..13	TheFourthSeal.—Motions & gen. pa.
Friday.....14..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..15	Sht. causes and general paper.
Monday 17	
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .19	
Thursday ..20	The Fifth Seal.—Mtns & gen. pa.
Friday ....21..	Petns. & gen. pa.
Saturday....22	Sht. causes and general paper.
Monday,May 24	
Tuesday 25	General paper.
Wednesday .26	
Thursday ..27	
Friday 28	The Sixth Seal.—Motions.
Saturday ..29	Remaining mtns. & petns.

The days (if any) on which the Lord Chancellor shall be engaged in the House of Lords, and the days (if any) on which the Lords Justices shall be sitting with the Lord Chancellor or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, are excepted.

At the Rolls, unopposed petitions must be presented and copies left with the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard; and any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

N.B.—The Master of the Rolls will hear further considerations in priority to original causes, until those set down before the 21st June have been disposed of, after which he will hear further considerations on every Monday during the sitting of the Court, but will not hear causes after the last seal. His Lordship will sit until the remaining motions and petitions and adjourned summonses shall have been disposed of.

Any causes intended to be heard as short causes before either of the Vice-Chancellors Malins or Wickens must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

The Vice-Chancellors Malins and Bacon will, at these sittings, and immediately after the first seal, hear further considerations in priority to original causes.

In Vice-Chancellor Bacon's Court, any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the proper papers be left with the Vice-Chancellor's officer on the day before the cause comes into the paper.

In Vice-Chancellor Wickens' Court no cause, motion for decree, or further consideration, except by order of the Court, may be marked to stand over if it be within twelve of the last cause or matter in the printed paper of the day for hearing.

The Courts will not sit after Saturday, the 5th August.

SUMMER CIRCUITS

NORFOLK.—Cockburn, C.J., and Byles, J.

Oakham, July 6; Leicester, July 8; Northampton, July 12, Aylesbury, July 17; Bedford, July 21; Huntingdon, July 25; Cambridge, July 28; Bury, August 1; Norwich, August 4.

NORTHERN.—Kelly, C.B., and Martin, J.

Appleby, July 6; Durham, July 8; Newcastle, July 12; Carlisle, July 17; Lancaster, July 20; Manchester, July 24; Liverpool, August 5.

HOME.—Bramwell, B., and Blackburn, J.

Hertford, July 8; Chelmsford, July 12; Lewes, July 18; Maidstone, July 24; Croydon, July 31.

OXFORD.—Pigott, B., and Lush, J.

Reading, July 8; Oxford, July 12; Worcester, July 15; Stafford, July 20; Shrewsbury, July 28; Hereford, August 1; Monmouth, August 4; Gloucester, August 8.

WESTERN.—Willes and Brett, JJ.

Winchester, July 10; Salisbury, July 15; Dorchester, July 19; Exeter, July 22; Bodmin, July 29; Wells, August 4; Bristol, August 9.

MIDLAND.—Mellor and Hannen, JJ.

Warwick, July 7; Derby, July 13; Nottingham, July Lincoln, July 21; York, July 27; Leeds, August 2.

NORTH WALES.—Bovill, C.J.

Newtown, July 17; Dolgelly, July 20; Carnarvon, July 24; Beaumaris, July 27; Ruthin, July 31; Mold, August 3; Chester, August 7.

SOUTH WALES.—Montagu Smith, J.

Haverfordwest, July 10; Cardigan, July 13; Carmarthen, July 17; Cardiff, July 20; Brecon, July 31; Presteign, August 3; Chester, August 7.

Cleasby, B., remains in town.

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

This Court will hold sittings on Saturday the 17th, Monday the 19th, Tuesday the 20th, Wednesday the 21st, Thursday the 22nd, Friday the 23rd, Saturday the 24th, and Monday the 26th days of June instant, and will at such sittings proceed in disposing of the business then pending in the Paper of New Trials and the Special Paper, and in giving judgment in cases standing for judgment.

FITZROY KELLY.
S. MARTIN.
A. CLEASBY.

LANCASHIRE SUMMER ASSIZES, 1871.

The commissions for holding these assizes will be opened at Lancaster on Thursday the 20th of July, at Manchester on Monday the 24th of July, and at Liverpool on Saturday the 5th of August. The entry of causes at Lancaster will commence immediately after the opening of the commissions on Thursday the 20th of July, and will close at nine o'clock on the following morning. Causes for trial at Manchester and Liverpool can be entered provisionally at the office of the Prothonotory of the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster, at Preston, as follows, viz.:—Causes for trial at Manchester, on Tuesday the 18th of July, and daily thereafter, until Friday the 21st of July inclusive, between the hours of ten o'clock in the forenoon and four o'clock in the afternoon; and causes for trial at Liverpool, on Monday the 31st of July, and daily thereafter, until Thursday the 3rd of August inclusive, between the above mentioned hours. The entry of causes at Manchester, will commence at the Assize Courts, Manchester, immediately after the opening of the commissions there, and will close at nine o'clock in the evening on the commission day. The entry of causes at Liverpool will commence at St. George's Hall, Liverpool, immediately after the opening of the commissions there, and will close at the sitting of the Court on Monday, the 7th August. The Court will sit at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, at Manchester, on the day next following the commission day; and at Liverpool at

eleven o'clock in the forenoon on the Monday next following the commission day. The trial of special jury causes will commence at Manchester at ten o'clock a.m. on Friday the 28th of July, and at Liverpool at ten o'clock a.m. on Thursday the 10th of August, and not earlier, unless the Court shall otherwise order. A list of causes for trial at Manchester and Liverpool respectively, each day (except the first), will be exhibited in the corridor of the Court and in the library.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869.

By an order of the Lord Chancellor, made in pursuance of the above Act, Geo John Graham and Mansfield Parkyns, Esqs., have been respectively released from their office of official assignees of the Court of Bankruptcy from and after the 30th June instant, and Peter Paget, Esq., will thereafter have and exercise all the powers and authorities and discharge all the duties of official assignee in respect of all matters of bankruptcy in which adjudication was made prior to the commencement of the said Act, and which are now pending in, or which may hereafter be transferred to, the New London Court of Bankruptcy, and in all such other matters of bankruptcy where and when the estate does not vest in creditors' assignees, the same shall vest in the said Peter Paget as such official assignee.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, June 16, 1871.

From the Official List of the actual business transacted.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92¼
Ditto for Account, July 5, 92¼
3 per Cent. Reduced 92¼
New 3 per Cent., 92¼
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73
Annuities, Jan. '80—
Annuities, April, '85
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 5 p m
Ditto, £500, Do — 5 p m
Ditto, £100 & £200, — 5 p m
Bank of England Stock, 4½ per Ct. (last half-year) 236
Ditto for Account,

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 209
Ditto for Account
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 109¾
Ditto for Account, —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 101½
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —
Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 93½
Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '72 100
Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 108
Ditto Debentures, per Cent., April, '64 —
Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 103
Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000 20 p m
Ditto, ditto, under £1000, 20 p m

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	92
Stock	Caledonian	100	92¾
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	115
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	41½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2	100	7½
Stock	Great Northern	100	127
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	138
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	101
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	94½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	140¾
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	53½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	17¾
Stock	London and North-Western	100	133
Stock	London and South-Western	100	97½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	53¾
Stock	Metropolitan	100	76¾
Stock	Midland	100	130¼
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	100
Stock	North British	100	44
Stock	North London	100	120
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	65½
Stock	South Devon	100	65
Stock	South-Eastern	100	87½
Stock	Taff Vale	100	166

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The markets have been dull and the amount of business transacted small, but prices have not shown a disposition to relax, except perhaps in a few instances in the foreign market. The funds have latterly moved upwards. To-day the Bank directors lowered the Bank rate from 2½ to 2¼ per cent., and prices have at once become strengthened. In the home railway market speculation seems to have been for a further retreat in prices, which, however, are just now buoyant, though the amount of business is small, this being the week of the fortnightly settlement.

THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE.—What we have to consider is whether we shall finally settle our own appeals or send them to England. The answer to this question really depends upon the improvements that can be effected in the Judicial Committee. If our appeals can be promptly despatched by such a court as one of the two highest courts in England, ought to be, we should feel very little inclination to attach weight to the reasons urged in favour of a local tribunal. But there is no doubt that a strong feeling of dissatisfaction with the present machinery for finally disposing of colonial appeals is rapidly growing in this country. It is too bad that the most important cases should be left untouched for two, for three, or even for four years. When at length the time for hearing arrives, there is no security that a court will be formed such as the colonies have a right to expect. A couple of retired Indian judges, an ex-Chancellor of Ireland, whose physical infirmities necessitated his retirement from the bench of that country; perhaps, if fortune favours us, a law lord or a judge who has contrived to steal an hour from his own work—such are the usual components of a Court whose decision in all colonial cases is final and unchallengeable. . . . We earnestly trust that neither pains nor cost will be spared to provide a fitting organ for the greatest appellate jurisdiction in the world. We look, therefore, with the deepest interest for the news of the promised law reforms of the Lord Chancellor. All that we ask is that our suits shall be decided by a fully-organised English Court, and not by some stray legal casuals. We think that the colonies are worth the salaries of three or four Judges, even if the expenses of the Court should mount up to £20,000 or £25,000 a year. Such a sum does not seem unreasonable for the dignity and efficiency of the oldest jurisdiction in the kingdom, and if we may fairly add, the greatest; and if England is so poor as to be unable to provide for the due performance of the Queen's primary duty, it will be well worth our while to contribute towards a Court which shall be fit to advise the Queen how to do right towards all her subjects who dwell beyond the limits of the British Isles—*Melbourne Argus.*

In the department of the Evening Classes at King's College, the legal distinctions for the winter session of 1870-71, were awarded as follows:—the prize in law and jurisprudence to Wilbar Scott Fox; certificates of merit to Henry Bridgeland, Robert Wilson, John Goode, Edwin Lane Raggatt, Richard Burgess, and Henry Coxhead: and the special prize to the student, who obtained the largest number of marks in law and jurisprudence, and in commercial law, and gave in the best essay on "Marriage settlements" to Henry Coxhead.

Mr. Joseph Mason Moore, solicitor, of South Shields, is a candidate for the Town Clerkship of that borough, rendered vacant by the death of Mr. J. Salmon. He has accordingly resigned his seat in the Town Council, and has also given notice of his intention of relinquishing the office of mayor, to which he was elected last year.

In the obituary notice of Sir John Rolt, which appeared in our last issue, we stated that Sir John Rolt became a Lord Justice in 1867, in succession to Sir J. L. Knight-Bruce. We should have said in succession to Sir G. Turner. Lord Justice Knight-Bruce died the preceding year, and was succeeded by Lord Cairns.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

June 6.—By Messrs. FAREBROTHER, CLARK, & Co.

Surrey, in the vicinity of Claremont, a plot of freehold building land, being a portion of the Apps Court Farm Estate containing 3r. 20p. Sold for £150.

By Mr. P. D. TUCKETT.

Dalston-place, Nos. 9 to 20, term 15¼ years, net rental £316. Sold for £2,310.

By Messrs. D. SMITH, SON, & OAKLEY

Essex, near Colchester; the "West Mersea-hall" estate of about 401 acres, with farm residence, cottages, and out-buildings, freehold. Sold for £15,000.

The perpetual advowson and next presentation to the vicarage of West Mersea, present incumbent aged 55. Sold for £400.

A freehold rent-charge of £502 10s. per annum, secured upon 2,379a. 0r. 35p., situate in the parish of West Mersea, subject to a charge of £105. Sold for £6,400.

The manor of West Mersea, yielding £15 6s. per annum. Sold for £1,550.

Three cottages, situate at West Mersea, freehold, and let at £14. Sold for £160.

Kent, Faversham, an orchard, containing 2a. 2r. 12p., being part of the Lorenden Estate, freehold. Sold for £350.

A close of land, containing 1a. 1r. 18p., freehold. Sold for £125

A close of arable land, containing 16a. 0r. 16p., freehold. Sold for £1,100.

A plot of marsh land, containing 25a. 0r. 32p., freehold. Sold for £2,375.

By Messrs. Debenham, Tewson & Farmer.

Kingsland-road, No. 26, let at £62 per annum, freehold. Sold for £900.

Grosvenor-square, No. 64, Mount-street, term 7¼ years, net rental £150. Sold for £720.

No. 98, Park-street, term 13¾ years, net rental £120. Sold for £940.

No. 103, same street, term 29¼ years, net rental £125. Sold for £1,670.

No. 11, Green-street, term 15¾ years, net rental £107. Sold for £930.

Russell-square, No. 20, Montague-street, term 27½ years, net rental £65. Sold for £760.

Forest-hill, a residence known as "South Bank," with pleasure grounds, and stabling, term 51½ years, net rental £72. Sold for £1,006.

An improved ground-rent of £34 10s., held for 4 years, amply secured on premises in Portland-place, Marylebone. Sold for £95.

A leasehold ground-rent of £7, secured on No. 6, Hamilton-place, Highbury. Sold for £100.

June 8.—By Messrs. Gadsden, Ellis, & Co.

Surrey, Horley, near the station, a freehold farm, known as Bonehurst-bridge, with homestead and 43a. 2r. 18p. Sold for £2,550.

In the parish of Leigh, a freehold house, with stabling, &c., and 1a. 0r. 11p. Sold for £250.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

Charles—On June 15, at 8, Elgin-crescent, Kensington-park, the wife of Arthur Charles, Esq., of a son.

Coode—On June 11, at 10, Ladbroke-grove, Notting-hill, the wife of Walter Coode, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

Kingsford—June 9, at Scarr Cottage, Hampstead, the wife of Douglas Kingsford, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

Graves—Benett—On June 13, at Trinity Church, Marylebone, Albert Reginald Graves, barrister-at-law, to Mary Jane, third daughter of William Morgan Benett, of 2, Chester-terrace, Regent's-park, Master of the Court of Common Pleas.

Sawbridge—Douthwaite—On June 8, at St. George's, Tufnell-park, Charles Sawbridge, of Wood-street, Cheapside, and Highbury-crescent, solicitor, to Margaret, youngest daughter of the late Henry Douthwaite, of Loraine-place, Holloway.

DEATHS.

Bannatyne—On June 11, at Milheugh, Blantyre, near Glasgow, Andrew Bannatyne, LL.D., solicitor, Glasgow.

Benthall—On June 5, Susanna, the wife of Francis Benthall, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law.

Hale—On June 4, at 25, Westbourne-park-road, after a short illness, William Palmer Hale, barrister-at-law, of the Middle Temple, aged 47.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

Friday, June 9, 1871.

Stretton, Chas Marston, & Chas Hy Herbert, Southampton-bldgs, Chancery-lane, Attorneys-at-Law and Solicitors. June 7.

Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

Friday, June 9, 1871.

Unlimited in Chancery.

West Bromwich and Walsall Railway Company.—Vice Chancellor Wickens has, by an order dated June 2, ordered that the above company be wound up. Baxter & Co, Victoria-st, Westminster, solicitors for the petitioner.

Limited in Chancery.

Cambrian Steam Packet Company (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated June 2, ordered that the above company be wound up. Field & Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields; agents for Lowndes Lpool, solicitor for the petitioner.

Castle Tavern Company (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated May 26, appointed Wm Head, Castle Tavern, Gresham-st, to be provisional official liquidator.

English Provident Assurance Company (Limited).—Creditors are requested, on or before July 3, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Fredk Bertram Smart, 85, Cheapside. Monday, July 17 at 1, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Leigh Gas Light and Coke Company (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated May 4, appointed Wm Wootton Woodman, 25, St Swithin's-lane, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before July 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Saturday, July 22 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

New Hotel Company, Dover (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Bacon has, by an order dated April 13, appointed Robt Payne, 39, Lothbury, and Joseph Allen, 37, Old Jewry, to be official liquidators. Creditors are required, on or before July 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Monday, July 24 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts or claims.

Tuesday, June 13, 1871.

Unlimited in Chancery.

Britannia Permanent Benefit Building Society.—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated June 2, ordered that the above society be wound up. Cleobury, jun, Cheapside, solicitor for the petitioner.

European Assurance Society.—Petition for winding up, presented June 10, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins, on Friday, June 23. Tucker, St. Swithin's-lane, solicitor for the petitioner.

Limited in Chancery.

Continental Wine Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 8, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins on June 23. Gole, Lime-st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Lobster and Salmon Fishing Company (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated June 2, ordered thath the above company be wound up. Blake, Lincoln's-inn-fields; agent for Moss & Co, Kingston-upon-Hull, solicitors for the petitioners.

Sanderson's Patents Association (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated June 2, ordered that the above association be wound up. Roffey, Old Jewry, solicitor for the petitioner.

Union Engineering Company (Limited).—Vice Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated June 1, ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued subject to the supervision of the Court. Sharp, Gresham House, solicitors for the petitioner.

Stannaries of Cornwall.

Friday, June 9, 1871.

Reperry Tin and Copper Mining Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 6, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden at Prince's Hall, Truro, on Monday, June 19 at 12. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing in opposition to the petition must be filed at the Registrar's office, Truro, on or before Thursday, June 15, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioner, his solicitors, or their agents. Gregory & Co, Bedford-row; agents for Hodge & Co, Truro, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

Friday, June 9, 1871.

gotley Friendly Society, Bugle Inn, Botley, Hants. June 7.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery

Last Day of Proof.

Friday, June 9, 1871.

Bird, John, Glassonby, Cumberland. July 5. Bird v Grout, M.R. Harrison, Penrith

Brown, Edwd Eusebius, Wednesbury, Stafford, Commercial Clerk. July 7. Hudson v Morrice, V.C. Malins. Field, New-inn, Strand

Campion, Richd, Denmark-hill, Camberwell, Esq. July 5. Anderson v Read, V.C. Wickens. De Jersey & Mickiem, Gresham-st West

Cooke, Sarah Fletcher, Salford, Lancashire, Widow. July 3. Whitaker v Goodwin, M.R. Myers, Manch

Gatley, Alfred, Rome, Sculptor. July 7. Orme v Gatley, V.C. Malins. Hand, Macclesfield

Hill, Lucy, Hundleby, Lincoln, Widow. July 1. Cross v Hill, V.C. Wickens. Thimbleby & Son, Spilsby

Hopkinson, Geo, Wotton, Gloucester, Esq. July 8. Hopkinson v Hopkinson, M.R. Whitcombe, Gloucester

Johnson, Robt Hy, Vicar of Claybrooke, Leicester. July 10. Wilkinson v Wood, V.C. Wickens. Cann Nottingham

Scarth, Hy, Barnes, Surrey, Esq. June 26. Dancer v H.M's Attorney-General. V.C. Malins. Robinson, Jermyn-st

Tharp, John, Froxfield, Southampton. June 28. Fish v Rivers, V.C. Wickens. Adams, Alresford

Truppo, Cosmo, Hadlow-st, Gent. June 21. Clark v Johnson, V.C. Wickens. Pike & Son, Old Burlington-st

Whitaker, Jas, Salford, Lancashire. July 3. Whitaker v Goodwin, M.R. Myers, Manch

Wilkins, John Wm, Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-law. Wilkins v Wilkins, V.C. Malins. Fry & Otter, Bristol

Tuesday, June 13, 1871

Ayers, John Wigg, Lingwood, Norfolk, Esq. July 5. Barratt v Ayers, V.C. Wickens. Emerson & Sparrow, Norwich

Bartlett, Chas Norton, Bletchington Grounds, Oxford, Farmer. July 7. Bartlett v Tanner, M.R. Malam, Oxford

Blundstone, Wm, Derby. July 14. Morris v Bagley, V.C. Wickens. Haywood, Derby

Halse, Edwd Peter, Jewin-crescent, Cripplegate, Gent. July 8. Francis v Braithwaite, M.R. Braithwaite, Guildford-st, Russell-sq

Megginson, Ingleby, Scarborough, York, Gent. July 5. Wood v Megginson, V.C. Malins. Prescod & Wood, York

Nibbs, Geo Langford, Fiddington, Somerset, Esq. July 6. Nibbs v Evered, V.C. Malins. Hewitt, Nicholas-lane, Lombard-st

Seymour, Rev Fras Payne, East Leigh, Southampton, Rector of Havant. July 10. Seymour v Williams, V.C. Malins. Oliver & Sons, Carey-st, Lincoln's-inn

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

Friday, June 9, 1871.

Berkefeld, Wm, Fenchurch-st. July 30. Crump, Philpot-lane

Borradaile, Jane, Carlisle, Widow. July 15. Wright, Carlisle

Burgess, John, Keene's-row, Walworth, Gent. July 31. Gover, King William-st

Clive, John Hy, Burslem, Stafford, Gent. June 24. Hollinshead, Tunstall
Cookes, John, Ealing, Middlesex, Gent. Sept 1. Field, Leamington Priors
Evans, Eliz, Gloucester, Widow. Aug 1. Wiltons & Riddiford, Gloucester
Gover, John, New Kent-rd, Esq. July 31. Gover, King William-st
Hernage, Mary Ann, Grampound, Cornwall, Widow. July 10. Shilson & Co, St Austell
Hope, Robt Wallis, Brighton, Sussex, Esq. Aug 1. Garrett, Doughty-st, Mecklenburgh-sq
Howell, Geo, Upper Redbrook, Monmouth, Esq. July 10. Winter & Maule, Newnham
Knatchbull, Wm Fras, Babington, Somerset, Esq. Oct 1. Mackay, Shepton Mallet
Lock, Eliz, Norwich, Widow. July 31. Brighten, Bishopsgate-st Without
Newman, John, Bures Hamlet, Essex, Miller. July 31. Wittey, Colchester
Peacock, Sarah, Astley, Worcester, Spinster. July 21. Pardoe, Bewdley
Russell, Dame Louisa Anne Frankland, Thirkleby-pk, York, Widow. Aug 1, Dunster, Henrietta-st, Cavendish-sq
Skey, Russell, Longford, Gloucester, Gent. Aug 1. Wiltons & Riddiford, Gloucester
Stocker, Rev Chas Wm, Draycot-le-Moors, Stafford. Aug 1. Coverdale & Co, Bedford-row
Trueman, Joseph, Tunbridge-Wells, Kent, Esq. Sept 5. Thomas & Hollams, Mincing-lane

TUESDAY, June 13, 1871.

Adams, Thos, Shipham, Somerset, Licensed Victualler, June 30. Parker, Axbridge
Archer, Saml Wm. Chesterford-ter, Stanley-rd, Hackney. July 25. Bartholomew, Ladbroke-grove, Notting-hill
Archer, Wm Jas, Mare-st, Hackney, Watchmaker. July 25. Bartholomew, Ludbroke-grove, Notting-hill
Attfield, Wm, Walworth-rd, Leather Cutter. July 10. Bayley Aldershot
Awdas, Jas, Sheffield, Shoeing Smith. Aug 12. Fretson, Sheffield
Basden, Mary, Plymouth, Devon, Widow. July 12. Cowlard, Lincoln's-inn-fields
Betham, Wm, Lincoln, Gent. Aug 12. Hebb, Lincoln
Bibby, Robt, Lamarsh, Essex, Farmer. July 31. Ransom, Sudbury
Bowgin, John, Southtown, Suffolk, Gent. June 24. Diver, Gt Yarmouth
Brearley, Hannah, Ley Moor, Golcar, York, Widow. July 22. Ramsden, Huddersfield
Bryant, Wm, Preston Plucknett, Somerset, Yeoman. July 24. Watts, Yeovil
Cawson, Saml, Salford, Lancashire, Wholesale Butcher. July 31. Brett & Co, Manch
Chatterton, Eliz, Nantwich, Chester, Spinster. Aug 1. Maddock & Co, Nantwich
Creswell, Wm Leonard, Nottingham, Warehouseman. July 31. Cann, Nottingham
Dagmore, John, Birm, Shawl & Mantle Dealer. July 13. Tyndall & Co, Birm
Gamble, Thos, Sheffield, Steel Manufacturer. July 31. Wake, Sheffield
Gibbs, Mary Ann, The Grove, Hackney. July 15. Mills & Lockyer, Brunswick-pl, City-rd
Grahame, Thos, Leamington, Warwick, Esq. Aug 31. Wilde & Co, College-hill
Hale, Geo Peter, Acton, Chester, Esq. Aug 1. Maddock & Co, Nantwich
Hall, Wm, Paultons-sq, Chelsea, Gent. July 10. Lee & Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields
Lowman, Eliz, Surbiton, Surrey, Widow. July 22. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury
Mactavish, Wm, Fort Garry, Canada, Governor. Sept 9. Barnard & Co, Lancaster-pl, Strand
Meal, John, Lingards, in Slaithwaite, York, Dyer. July 8. Ramsden, Huddersfield
Morris, David, Manch, Mill Valuer. July 31. Brett & Co, Manch
Newby, Jas, Ambleside, Westmoreland, Draper. July 1. Holton, Kendal
Nickson, Isaac, Leeds, Painter. Aug 31. Cranswick, Leeds
Payne, Sophia, Harper-st, Red Lion-sq. Aug 1. Garrett, Doughty-st, Mecklenburgh-sq
Piercy, Nathan, York, Builder. Sept 1. Walker, York
Postle, Edwd, Schloss Herblingen, Schaffhausen, Switzerland, Esq. July 15. Bensly, Norwich
Radcliffe, Jas, West Derby, nr Lpool, Gent. July 10. Morecroft, Lpool
Russell, Dame Louisa Maria Oldnall, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Widow. Aug 1. Wight, Dudley
Scorer, Wm, Royal Exchange-bldgs, Notary Public. July 31. Winter, St Swithin's-lane
Taylor, Eliza, Crewe, Chester, Widow. Aug 1. Maddock & Co, Nantwich
Taylor, John, Rock, Huddersfield, Cloth Manufacturer. July 22. Ramsden, Huddersfield
Taylor, Saml, Southport, Lancashire, Gent. Sept 9. Briggs & Bailey, Bolton-le-Moors
Tharme, Ellen, Albrighton, Salop, Spinster. July 15. Riley, Wolverhampton
Thomson, John, Rockhampton, Queensland, Commission Agent. Aug 14. Wood & Killick, Bradford

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 9, 1871.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Cohen, Hy, Houndsditch, Fancy Warehouseman. Pet June 6. Hazlitt. June 20 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Allan, Jas Frith, Sheffield, Britannia Metal Manufacturer. Pet June 8. Wake. Sheffield, June 21 at 1
Bacon, J. W., Brigg, Lincoln, Common Brewer. Pet June 5. Bates. Gt Grimsby, June 24 at 11
Creighton, Wm, Crewe, Chester, Baker. Pet June 1. Broughton. Crewe, June 22 at 12
Denham, Wm Hempson, Southsea, Hants, Surgeon. Pet June 5. Hellard. Portsmouth, June 20 at 12
Harbridge, Isabella, Lpool, Cart Owner. Pet June 5. Hime. Lpool, June 29 at 2
Hutchinson, Ann, Manch, Stationer. Pet June 7. Kay. Manch, June 22 at 9.30
Knaggs, John, Nafferton, York, Tailor. Pet June 7. Phillips. Kingston-upon-Hull, June 21 at 11
Knight, Wm, Stafford, Tinman. Pet June 6. Spilsbury. Stafford, June 22 at 12
Luckin, Edwd, Lurgashall, Sussex, Farmer. Pet June 6. Eversheld. Brighton, June 27 at 11
Nicholson, John, Sheffield, Cutlery Manufacturer. Pet June 7. Wake. Sheffield, June 21 at 1
Petitjean, Wm Hy, Manch, Merchant. Pet June 7. Lister. Salford, June 21 at 11
Rayne, Edwd Fletcher, Roehampton, Surrey, Gent. Pet June 6. Willoughby. Wandsworth, June 30 at 10.30
Raynor, Robt, Burbage, Derby, Grocer. Pet June 7. Hyde. Stockport, June 23 at 12
Rowland, John, Wrexham, Denbigh, Brewer. Pet June 5. Reid. Wrexham, June 21 at 2
Ryder, John, Frodsham, Chester, Provision Dealer. Pet June 5. Nicholson. Warrington, June 22 at 11
Shaw, Wm Edwd, Macclesfield, Chester, Draper. Pet June 5. Mair. Macclesfield, June 21 at 12
Summers, Thos, Barnsley, York, Rope Manufacturer. Pet June 7. Bury. Barnsley, June 22 at 11
Whitley, Fredk, Bradford, York, Woolstapler. Pet June 2. Robinson. Bradford, June 20 at 9
Widdall, Thos, Little Birchall, Stafford, Silk Manufacturer. Pet June 5. Mair. Macclesfield, June 22 at 12
Williams, Rebecca, Lpool, Draper. Pet June 7. Hime. Lpool, June 30 at 2
Wood, Jas, Nottingham, Hair Net Manufacturer. Pet June 6. Patchitt. Nottingham, July 4 at 12

TUESDAY, June 13, 1871.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Chidley, Sydney, Queen Victoria-st, Solicitor. Pet June 7. Spring-Rice. June 29 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Appleby, Fras, Scarborough, York, Innkeeper. Pet June 10. Woodall. Scarborough, July 3 at 3
Aspden, John, Manch, Baker. Pet June 9. Kay. Manch, June 29 at 10
Bailey, Arthur Berrisford, Fulshaw, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 8. Kay. Manch, June 29 at 9.30
Beaureau, Thos, Preston, Lancashire, Baker. Pet June 9. Myres. Preston, June 24 at 11
Bradley, Geo, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey, Builder. Pet June 9. Bell. Kingston, July 6 at 3
Bullen, Joseph, & Hy Bullen, Lpool, Brewers. Pet June 10. Hime. Lpool, July 4 at 2
Davies, Wm, Tibberton, Salop, Provision Dealer. Pet June 7. Potts. Madeley, June 26 at 12
Daw, Saml, Cheriton Fitzpaine, Devon, Butcher. Pet June 9. Daw. Exeter, June 24 at 10
Hawkins, Fredk, Hillside, Upper Norwood, Builder. Pet June 9. Rowland. Croydon, June 24 at 11
Hawkins, Geo, St Aubyn-rd, Upper Norwood, Builder. Pet June 9. Rowland. Croydon, June 24 at 11
Johnson, Wm, Dover, Kent, Sailmaker. Pet June 2. Callaway. Canterbury, June 21 at 11
Lewers, Wm, Salford, Lancashire, Flour Dealer. Pet June 9. Lister. Salford, June 28 at 10.30
Masters, Thos Hy, Lpool, Comm Merchant. Pet June 7. Hime. Lpool, July 3 at 2
Nisbett, Jas Meade, Clifton, Bristol, Clerk in Holy Orders. Pet June 8. Harley. Bristol, June 29 at 12
Wadsworth, Jas, Manch, Butcher. Pet June 8. Kay. Manch, June 29 at 9.30

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, June 9, 1871.

Miller, Wm Robertson, Birm, Hay Factor. May 18

TUESDAY, June 13, 1871.

Bruton, Danl, Brunswick-sq., no occupation. June 5
Duncalfe, Geo Cheveley, Albrighton, Salop, Coal Merchant. June 7
Ellingworth, Wm, West Tilbury, Essex, Cattle Dealer. May 24

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, June 9, 1871.

Aston, Thos, Manch, Milk Dealer. June 22 at 3, at offices of Smith Boyer, Brazennose st, Manch
Andrews, Geo, Chickerell, Dorset, Butcher. June 24 at 3.30, at the Junction Hotel, Dorchester
Armistead, Josephus Rollin, Eccleshill, York, Bootmaker. June 16 at 11, at offices of Terry & Robinson, Market st, Bradford
Backett, Mary Ann, Alpha rd, New Cross, out of business. June 26 at 2, at offices of Treherne & Wollerstan, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside
Bayliff, Wm, Manch, Leather Dealer. June 24 at 10, at office of Peel, Chapel lane, Bradford
Baxter, Geo, Swansea, Glamorgan, Bookseller. June 16 at 3, at office of Davies, Rutland st, Swansea

Booth, Edwd, Booth st, Lambeth, Corn Dealer. June 16 at 3, at offices of Hicklin & Washington, Trinity sq, Southwark
Briggs, Wm, Leicester, Plumber. June 23 at 1, at office of Owston, Friar lane, Leicester
Brown, Wm, Winterbourne Stoke, Wilts, Farmer. June 23 at 12, at the White Hart Hotel, Salisbury. Whatman
Clark, John, White Lion ct, Birchin lane, Licensed Victualler, June 28 at 2, at office of Walter, George st, Mansion house
Cocks, Geo Dawson, Deal, Kent, Linen Draper. June 22 at 11, at the Royal Exchange Hotel, Deal. Drew
Colclough, Wm, Tunstall, Stafford, Journeyman Potter. June 16 at 2, at office of Alcock, Goldenhill, nr Tunstall
Comann, Joseph, Manch, Restaurant Keeper. June 19 at 2, at office of Evans, Cross st, Manch
Cooper, Benj, Burnley, Lancashire, Manager. June 21 at 3, at offices of Backhouse & Whittam, Ormerod st, Burnley
Cowell, Geo Whiting, Lee green, Kent, Veterinary Surgeon. June 20 at 2, at the Tiger's Head inn, Lee green. Furley, Canterbury
Craig, John, Middlesborough, York, Draper. June 19 at 12, at offices of Greener & Co, Station st, Middlesborough. Dobson, Middlesborough
Croft, Wm Llewellyn, Hill Croome, Worcester, Clerk in Holy Orders. June 23 at 11, at offices of Corbett, Avenue house, The Cross, Worcester
Cummings, Wm, New Elvet, Durham, Grocer. June 22 at 3, at the Turf Hotel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Marshall, Durham
Cuncliffe, Ellen, Edith, Wigan, Lancashire, Draper. June 21 at 11, at office of Lees, King st, Wigan
De Vismes, Hy, Bedford, Gent. June 28 at 12, at offices of Whyley & Piper, Dame Alice st, Bedford
Dorkes, Fras, Park lane, Piccadilly, Dining-room Keeper. July 3 at 2, at offices of Nash & Co, Suffolk lane, Cannon st
Ebbs, John, Edwd Jones Ebbs & Joseph Ebbs, Northwick ter, Maida hill, Builders. June 28 at 3, at office of Lewis & Co, Old Jewry
Elliott, Joseph, Luton, Bedford, Butcher. June 20 at 3, at the Swan Hotel, Leighton Buzzard. Scargill, Luton
Epps, Wm, Buckhurst hill, Essex, Provision Merchant. June 22 at 4, at offices of Challis & Co, Clement's lane. Stubbs, Eastcheap
Ewbank, Thos Joseph, Lpool, Artist. June 27 at 3, at offices of Duke & Goffey, Commerce chambers, Lord st, Lpool
Firmin, Douglas, East Retford, Notts, Coach Builder. June 23 at 12, at the White Hart Hotel, Bridge st, East Retford. Mee & Co, East Retford
Gallaway, Joseph, Bethnal green rd, Butcher. June 15 at 1, at offices of Thwaite, Basinghall st. Dobie, Basinghall st
Greenfield, Hy, Horsham, Sussex, Builder. June 26 at 2, at the King's Head Hotel, Horsham. Dubois & Griffiths, Church passage, Guildhall yd
Grisbrook, Thos, Hastings, Sussex, Painter. June 21 at 3, at the Imperial Club, Cursitor st, Chancery lane. Philbrick, Hastings
Harding, John, Eastbourne, Sussex, Builder. June 22 at 12, at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Coles, Eastbourne
Harris, Alf, Melksham, Wilts, Butcher. June 26 at 11, at the Bear Hotel, Chippenham. Rawlings, Melksham
Hart, Hy, High st, Whitechapel, Gasfitter. July 4 at 3, at offices of Webb, Austinfriars
Hartwig, Augustus, Albion ter, The Grove, Hammersmith, Baker. June 29 at 2, at offices of Hilleary & Tunstall, Fenchurch bldgs
Hindmarch, Joseph Johnson, South Sields, Durham, Blockmaker. June 22 at 2, at offices of Maxwell & Moore, Market pl, South Shields
Hoare, Wm, Birm, Surgeon. June 23 at 12, at offices of Powell, Clarendon chambers, Temple st, Birm
Hunter, Alex, Hunter's wharf, Bell Water gate, Woolwich, Coal Merchant, June 22 at 3, at offices of Linklater & Co, Walbrook
Hutchins, Thos, Bradford, York, Boot Manufacturer, June 23 at 3, at the Blackfriars Hotel, Blackfriars bridge, Manch. Hargreaves
Keates, Saml, Wells, Somerset, Wheelwright. June 24 at 12, at offices of Hobbs, Wells
Kimber, John, Exeter, General Dealer. June 17 at 11, at the White Lion inn, St Sidwells. Flood, Exeter
Knight, Wm Horace Withy, Wells st, Whitechapel, Journeyman Carpenter. June 19 at 3, at offices of Holmes & Holmes, Finsbury pl, South
Lawrence, Edwd, Southsea, Hants, Butcher. June 26 at 3, at office of Ford, Queen st, Portsea
Lewis, Alf, Bath, Somerset, Tobacconist. June 24 at 3, at offices of McCarthy, John st, Frome
Leyshon, Wm, Swansea, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. June 19 at 11, at offices of Field & Home, Mount st, Swansea
Littlejohns, Hy Thos, Shebbear, Devon, Mason. June 22 at 12, at offices of Bromham, High st, Barnstaple
Marginson, Robt, Bolton, Lancashire, Ironfounder. June 22 at 2, at office of Ryley, Mawdsley st, Bolton
Marks, Saml, Orchard st, Portman sq, Coachmaker. June 24 at 3, at 13 Orchard st, Portman sq, Scott, South sq, Gray's inn
Martin, Geo, Queen st, Brompton, Fruiterer. June 23 at 2, at office of Venn, New inn, Strand
Martin, Robt & Wm Martin, Lpool, Grocers. June 23 at 3, at office of Carmichael, Cambridge chambers, Lord st, Lpool. Nordon, Lpool
Millward, Wm Albert, Walsall, Stafford, Furniture Dealer. June 21 at 12, at offices of Green, Waterloo st, Birm
Mitchell, Thos, Manch, Builder. June 27 at 3, at offices of Jones, Princess st, Manch
Mugleston, Joseph, Winshill, Derby, Licensed Victualler. June 22 at 11, at office of Wilson, Guild st, Burton-on-Treat
Nutt, Wm Hy, Grafton st, Fitzroy sq, Manager to a Bookbinder. June 23 at 3, at offices of Thwaite, Basinghall st. Dobie, Basinghall st
Page, Wm Evan, Sheffield, Hosier. June 19 at 4, at offices of Sugg, Fig Tree chambers, Sheffield
Parry, Thos, Grossion, Carnarvon, Coal Dealer. June 22 at 12, at the Liverpool Arms Hotel, Brook st, Chester. Williams, Parthyraur
Parsons, Jas, Bath, Beer Retailer. June 24 at 11, at office of Wilton, Old King st, Queen sq, Bath
Perkins, David, St John's Wood ter, Nurseryman. June 26 at 2, at office of Hortin, Edgware rd
Peverelle, Chas, Manch, General Dealer. June 28 at 2, at offices of Cohen & Sons, Swan st, Manch
Roberts, Jas, Radstock, Somerset, Drill Instructor. June 16 at 4, at offices of McCarthy, King st, Frome
Rowland, Geo Chas, Richmond, Surrey, Compiler of Indices. July 1 at 3, at the Duke's Head Tavern, Vine yd, Richmond. Rigby, Botolph lane
Saunders, Joseph, Pontypool, Monmouth, Fruiterer. June 20 at 2, at offices of Lloyd, Park ter, Pontypool
Schofield, Edwin Arthur, Barnsley, Stay Manufacturer. June 20 at 2, at office of Earle, Market st, Sheffield. Frudd, Barnsley
Shepherd, Geo, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. June 22 at 12, at office of Wood, Week day Cross, Market st, Nottingham
Smith, Wm Manning, Holbrook, Suffolk, Carpenter. June 27 at 12, at office of Pollard, St Lawrence st, Ipswich
Stoney, Thos, Warwick, Furniture Polisher. June 22 at 11, at the Angel Hotel, Leamington Priors. Snape, Warwick
Sweet, John, Bideford, Devon, Furniture Broker. June 24 at 11, at offices of Hole & Peard, Willett st, Bideford
Tarver, Wm Hy, Eton College, Buckingham, Assistant Master. June 24 at 11, at offices of Barrett, High st, Eton
Trubshaw, Jas, Bedford gardens, Kensington, Architect. June 26 at 2, at offices of Church & Co, Bedford row
Tucker, Michael & Jethro Tucker, Exeter, Grocers. June 21 at 11, at offices of Harris & Co, Gandy st chambers Exeter. Hooper
Whitaker, Wm Hy, Bradford, York, Tailor. June 21 at 10, at offices of Hargreaves, Market st, Bradford
Whitehead, Thos, Whitehaven, Cumberland. June 22 at 3, at office of Mason, Duke st, Whitehaven
Whiting, Saml, Ewell, Surrey, Beer Retailer. June 28 at 12, at the Wheelwrights' Arms, Southbridge lane, Croydon Buchanan, Basinghall st
Wilson, Wm, Appledore Station, Kent, Higgler. June 23 at 11, at the Cinque Port Arms Hotel, Rye. Langham
Yates, Wm & Alf Yates, Florence ter, Shepherd's Bush rd, Builders. June 22 at 2, at office of Lamb, Bedford row

TUESDAY, June 13, 1871.

Akenhead, Wm, Blyth, Northumberland, Grocer. June 26 at 11, at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Bamford, Geo, Birm, Bailiff. June 26 at 3, at office of East, Colmore row, Birm
Bannister, Chas, Bradford, York, Grocer. June 28 at 10, at offices of Atkinson, Fountain st, Bradford. Lancaster, Bradford
Berrill, Geo, Northampton, Builder. June 28 at 3, at the George Hotel, Bridge st, Northampton. Moss
Bradford, Douglas, Litchurch, Derby, Joiner. June 29 at 3, at offices of Briggs, Full st, Derby
Chambers, Dani, Oadby, Leicester, out of business. June 28 at 3, at office of Cowdell, jun, Hinckley
Cooke, Jas, Dafarn-newydd Abersoch, Carnarvon, Victualler. June 24 at 2, at 6 Market st, Carnarvon. Jones, Pwllheli
Cordingley, Jas, Bolton, Lancashire, Skipmaker. June 26 at 2, at offices of Winder, Bowker's row, Bolton
Crabtree, Frank, Dewsbury, York, Joiner. June 27 at 3, at offices of Scholes & Brearey, Leeds rd, Dewsbury
Danks, Saml, Birm, Land Surveyor. June 20 at 12, at offices of Griffin, Bennett's hill, Birm
Davies, Hy, Cwmburla, Swansea, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. June 20 at 11, at office of Morris, Rutland st, Swansea
Dixon, John, Bradford, York, Iron Merchant. June 26 at 3, at offices of Taylor & Co, Piccadilly, Bradford
Doel, Wm, Southwick, Wilts, Farmer. June 28 at 11, at office of Rawlings, Silver st, Trowbridge
Dyson, John, Meltham, York, Grocer. June 27 at 4, at the Swan with Two Neck's inn, Westgate, Huddersfield. Booth, Holmfirth
Earl, John, Willesborough, Kent, Carrier. June 26 at 11, at office of Furley & Co, Ashford
Edwards, Geo, Winkleigh, Devon, Licensed Victualler. June 20 at 11, at the Fountain inn, Okehampton. Burd, Okehampton
Ellis, Hy, Rye lane, Peckham, Builder. June 28 at 2, at offices of Poncione, jun, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn
England, Wm, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Beer Retailer. June 27 at 12, at office of Clarke, Buckingham rd, Aylesbury
Evans, Wm Ferriday, Lpool, Coach Builder. July 1 at 11, at office of Gibson & Bolland, South John st, Lpool. Anderson & Co
Fisher, Wm, Aberdare, Tavern Keeper. July 1 at 11, at the Temperance hall, Aberdare. Linton, Aberdare
Foxard, Thos, Batley, York, Joiner. June 26 at 3, at the Royal Hotel, Dewsbury. Ibberson, Dewsbury
Garlick, Wm, Bath, Timber Dealer. June 26 at 11, at office of Wilton, Abbey Churchyard, Bath
Hall, Wm, Seaham Harbour, Durham, Shipowner. June 30 at 1, at offices of Wright, John st, Sunderland
Hammond, Eliz Mary, Red Cross st, Wholesale Milliner. June 24 at 12, at office of Mardon, Newgate st
Hampson, Wm, Tranmere, Chester, Stone Merchant. June 26 at 2, at office of Downham, Market st, Birkenhead
Harriot, Thos, Queen's sq, Westminster, Brewer. June 23 at 3, at offices of Sherrard, Clifford's inn
Harrison, John Chas & Wm Edwards, Green's ter, Deptford rd, Rotherhithe, Builders. June 26 at 12, at offices of Ford, Moorgate st. Leverton, Bishopsgate st, Within
Hartley, Geo, Soyland, Halifax, York, Contractor. June 28 at 12, at the White Lion Hotel, Halifax. Davy
Hay, Alex, Sheffield, Wine Merchant. June 23 at 3, at offices of Doyle & Edwards, Carey st. Webster & Pickard, Sheffield
Hibbert, Wm & Andrew McGuire, Manch, Printers. June 26 at 4, at offices of Addleshaw, King st, Manch
Hickey, Thos, Swansea, Glamorgan, Tailor. June 23 at 11, at office of Morris, Rutland st, Swansea
Holden, Howard Ashton, Bedford sq, Contractor. June 29 at 11, at the Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Edmonds, Bush lane, Cannon st
Holland, Jas, Salford, Lancashire, Baker. June 29 at 2, at offices of Cobbett & Co, Brown st, Manch
Huggett, Benj Richard, Evelyn st, Deptford, Carman. June 29 at 2, at office of Norton & Co, Walbrook
Hulse, Thos, Winsford, Chester, Boat Builder. June 30 at 12, at offices of Jones, Princess st, Manch
Jackson, Vincent Wm, West Hartlepool, Durham, Chemist. June 26 at at 11, at the Raglan Hotel, West Hartlepool
Jones, Fredk Arthur, Manch, Journeyman Designer. June 24 at 11, at office of Hardy, St James's sq, Manch
Lord, Jas, Mitre ct bldgs, Temple, Barrister-at-Law. July 5 at 3, at offices of Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry

Lindsey, Wm & Wm Fisher, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Tavern Keepers. June 29 at 2, at offices of Barnard & Co, Albion chambers, Bristol.
Linton, Aberdare
Lowe, Wm, Darlaston, Stafford, Provision Dealer. June 27 at 2, at offices of Glover, Park st, Walsall
Lyth, John, Ruthin, Denbigh, Publican. June 27 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Chester
Mayers, John Adams, Gt Yarmouth, Norfolk, Butcher. June 26 at 12, at offices of Wiltshire, Regent st, Gt Yarmouth
Moss, Thos, Lpool, Book Keeper. June 29 at 3, at office of Nordon, Cook st, Lpool
Mountain, Jas Longstaff, Sheffield, out of business. June 21 at 11, at office of Turner, Market st, Sheffield
Oates, John, Handsworth Woodhouse, York, Grocer. June 27 at 12, at office of Tasker & Sons, North Church st, Sheffield. Gee, Chesterfield
Pountney, Richd John, Amblecote, Stafford, Grocer. June 26 at 10.30, at offices of Wall, Union chambers, Stourbridge
Pritchard, Wm, Plymouth, Devon, Draper. June 26 at 11, at offices of Elworthy & Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth
Ratcliffe, Wm, Preston, Lancashire, Beerseller. June 26 at 11, at office of Morris, Market st, Chorley
Reede, Saml Thos, Lpool Comm Agent. June 26 at 3, at offices of Forrest, Fenwick st, Lpool
Robinson, Aaron, Sunderland, Durham, Builder. June 24 at 1, at office of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
Robinson, Joseph, Longton, Stafford, Tailor. June 28 at 3, at the Home Trade Association rooms, York st, Manch. Sale & Co, Manch
Rogers, Jas, jun, Nottingham, Plumber. June 30 at 12, at office of Simpson, Bank chambers, Nottingham
Rosenberg, Hy, Bognor, Sussex, Schoolmaster. June 24 at 2, at the Claremont Hotel, Bognor. Salaman, St Swithin's lane
Rudge, Saml Holloway, Longton, Stafford, Tobacconist. June 26 at 3, at the Bull's Head inn, Market pl, Macclesfield. Cooper, Congleton
Senin, Wm. Leptin, York, Farmer. June 29 at 11, at the County Court, Huddersfield. Freeman
Skidmore, Fredk, Princes End, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. June 24 at 3, at office of Bowen, Mount Pleasant, Bilston
Skingle, Jabez, Fitzroy rd, Regent's Park rd, Life Assurance Agent. June 26 at 3, at office of Peverley, Basinghall st
Sparks, Robt & Chas Barber, Galmington, Somerset, Tallow Chandlers. June 26 at 12.30, at 39 Broad st, Bristol. Trenchard, Taunton
Stalker, Hy, Provost st, City rd, Hosier. July 4 at 3, at offices of Bilton, Coleman st
Sandford, Jas, Chalksole green, Kent, Carpenter. June 23 at 3, at 50 Castle st, Dover. Minter, Folkestone
Stevenson, Jas, Liverpool st, Walworth, out of business. June 23 at 3, at offices of Hicklin & Washington, Trinity sq, Southwark
Thompson, Thos, Wellingborough, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. June 27 at 3.30, at the Hind Hotel, Wellingborough. Becke, Northampton
Tomlinson, Geo Withnall, Ashbourne, Derby, Attorney-at-Law. June 28 at 11, at the Green Man inn, Ashbourne. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent
Watt, John Chas, Birm, Iron Bedstead Manufacturer. June 23 at 12, at offices of Cottrell, Newhall st, Birm
Wilson, Wm Nelson & Hugh Wilson, Manch, Calico Printers. June 29 at 3, at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manch. Hampson, Manch
Wonencroft, Geo, West Gorton, nr Manch, Bootmaker. June 23 at 3, at offices of Sutton & Elliott, Brown st, Manch